

THE SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH AND RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN
REGARD TO INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING FUNDING
DURING THE BUSH ERA

by

Krystie Rose Millich

B.A., Washington State University, 1995

A thesis submitted to the
University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Political Science

2007



The thesis for the Master of Arts

degree by

Krystie Rose Millich

has been approved

by



Jana M. Everett



Lucy C. McGuffey



Steve C. Thomas

11/26/07

Date

Millich, Krystie Rose (M.A., Political Science)

The Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Movement In Regard to
International Family Planning Funding During the Bush Era

Thesis directed by Professor Jana Everett

ABSTRACT

Most social movement literature examines movements' abilities to enact social change under favorable political opportunity structures. This paper instead analyzes how a social movement, the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) movement, has responded to the negative political opportunity structures of the George W. Bush era. I utilize a political process/social movement framework to examine the political opportunity structures and movement action strategies of this enduring, dynamic movement. Phone interviews with spokespersons from central actor NGOs are utilized to provide a firsthand account of the movement's work during the Bush era. Despite, or even due to, the extremely negative macro-political environment of neoliberalism, globalization, and religious fundamentalisms and the combative Bush administration, the paper shows that the SRHR movement is still able to achieve some success and, in some instances, even improve upon their strategies to ensure the movement remains resilient.

This abstract accurately represents the content of the candidate's thesis. I recommend its publication.

Signed

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Jana M. Everett.

Jana M. Everett

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my Husband, who has always supported me in whatever I have wanted to do with my life. I hate to think what this experience might have been without his love, jokes, laughs, understanding, Mexico vacation companionship, walking partnership, excitement at living a healthy lifestyle, shoulder to cry on, wonderful family, parenting, housework, Broncos support, movie companionship, smiley face, lightheartedness, and happy willingness to be woken up at all hours of the night by whatever doubts or frustrations I might have been facing. I also dedicate this thesis to my parents and my family, who, like my Husband, have always supported me in whatever I have wanted to do with my life. They have been there for me through thick and thin; at times when I didn't know how I was going to make it. I am also extremely grateful that they have battled their health conditions and won, so that they can be here to see me reach this goal and for many years to come. I am indeed blessed to have grown up with two parents who told me I could do whatever I wanted and not to "grow up and *marry* a Doctor", but to "grow up and BE a Doctor". I would also like to thank my friends; old and new; those that have contributed to my life in immeasurable ways that even they may never fully realize. My friends are like a second family and I owe them for all their wonderful support, fun, insights, camaraderie, and understanding. I also owe a deep debt of gratitude to all of the role models I have had in my life who have inspired and encouraged me to strive for my goals and to make my life the best that it can be. The female role models, especially, showed me what I could do with my life and what it meant to be a strong woman in this society. Grandma Rose is, of course, at the top of that list. My life would not be what it is today had I not had these incredible angels fly into my world; sometimes I am amazed when I think about the wonderful people that come into your life at just the right time. Lastly, I want to thank my babies, Buster and Nikki, for giving me unconditional love (even if Nikki the cat *sometimes* attached conditions) and to Buster for making me laugh every single day.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to give my thanks to my chair, advisor, and role model Jana Everett, for her inspiration, experience, compassion, understanding, patience, insights, and overall support throughout both my graduate program and my thesis work. Her calm tone, understanding, and patience got me through the times when I wondered if I could make it through this thesis process. I am also grateful for her experiences with and commitment to social issues, especially in my interest area of gender issues, allowing me to customize my work to the issues I felt most strongly about. I am also grateful to Jana as well as Glenn Morris for providing me with excellent experiences as a Teaching Assistant. I would also like to thank my committee members for their participation and the faculty that made my graduate program a valuable, rewarding learning experience: Wadi Muhaisen, Christoph Stefes, Andrea Haar, Tony Robinson, Steve Thomas, and Lucy McGuffey. I would like to thank my fellow students and Graduate Student Club members for their camaraderie, support, and insights in an always rewarding, but sometimes trying, graduate school experience. Lastly, I would like to extend my gratitude to Cory Gruebele for always being there with a smile, a helpful manner, and a myriad of accurate, comprehensive information. He is a true gem who goes above and beyond to ensure that the department's students and faculty are the most successful that they can be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Theoretical Perspective | 5 |
| Thesis Statement | 7 |
| Literature Review | 7 |
| Methodology | 12 |
| Thesis Structure | 13 |
| 2. POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES | 15 |
| Changes in Political Alignments | 16 |
| Access to Institutions | 16 |
| Religious Fundamentalists at the UN | 17 |
| Bush, SRHR, the UN and International Policy | 19 |
| UN changes in Population Assistance | 21 |
| Influential Opponents and Allies | 23 |
| Opponents | 23 |
| Allies | 32 |
| Conclusion | 34 |
| 3. MOVEMENT ACTION STRATEGIES | 35 |
| Framing | 35 |
| “Safe Motherhood” or “Maternal Mortality” | 36 |
| SRHR Promoting Social and Economic Development | 36 |
| “A Prevention Challenge” | 37 |
| Action Strategies | 37 |
| Work at the UN | 38 |
| New Funders | 39 |
| Impact Reports | 41 |
| Work of Central Actor NGOs | 42 |
| Conclusion | 51 |
| 4. ACHIEVMENTS, CHALLENGES, AND THE FUTURE | 52 |
| Movement Achievements | 53 |
| Ongoing Challenges | 55 |
| Future Outlook | 56 |
| 2007 Congress | 56 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Pro-Choice President in 2009?..... | 58 |
| New Technologies | 58 |
| SRHR at Beijing+15 in 2010 | 59 |
| Conclusion | 60 |

APPENDIX

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| A. LIST OF ACRONYMS | 62 |
|---------------------------|----|

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| REFERENCES..... | 63 |
|-----------------|----|

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis paper, I provide an analysis of how the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) movement has responded to the Bush administration in regard to international family planning funding and policy. I ground this analysis within the context of neoliberalism, globalization, and religious fundamentalism, utilizing political process theory (McAdam, 1982) and social movement theory (Tarrow, 2001, 1998, Benford and Snow, 2000) in order to provide a systematic examination of the broad range of factors impacting the movement's responses. I utilize existing literature in my study as well as phone interviews with central actor non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the SRHR movement.

Globalization has dramatically altered the ways in which individuals, corporations, and governments interact with one another in the new, free-trade-driven global marketplace. Antrobus (2004) notes that trade liberalization requires the adoption of a common policy framework by all countries and that the current macro-economic policy frameworks under globalization are neoliberalism and structural adjustment (p. 68). Neoliberalism can be defined as a new ('neo') type of economic liberalism which advocates the free market above all else, the reduced role of governments, deregulation, and privatization.

Antrobus (2004) defines structural adjustment as a policy that persuades "...governments of less-developed countries to: cut allocations to key sectors such as education, health, welfare and agriculture; cut subsidies to the poor; privatize public services and public sector investments; and to devalue their currencies" (p. 68). She goes on to explain that: "...these policies undermined the capacity of (nation-) states to guarantee the well-being of the majority of their citizens. The retreat of the state from the provision of social services and from policies to protect the most vulnerable groups compromised the very legitimacy of many states" (p. 69). These changes in the role of government coincided with a rise in private, voluntary organizations formed to serve unmet needs, referred to as non-profit organizations in the U.S. and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) outside the U.S. Instead of re-directing government monies to private NGOs to provide services at the same funding level, the world's governments have decreased their domestic social and health spending and foreign aid, especially so on the part of the United States¹.

¹ Even though the U.S. is still the largest donor for foreign aid programs, it is only because they are the richest country in the world. Measured as a percentage of GNP, the U.S. ranks *last* in foreign aid spending among 21 industrialized member countries of the Development Assistance

One of the areas tremendously impacted by the effects of neoliberalism in the past three decades has been reproductive health care services. When neoliberal policies called for slashing government funding in the provision of reproductive health services, NGOs became the primary providers for many women in developing countries. Recent U.S. Republican Presidents have seized the opportunity to spread the gospel of their anti-abortion and anti-reproductive rights agenda by slashing family planning funding and establishing and maintaining such policies as the 'Mexico City Policy' (aka the 'Global Gag Rule') to further limit these women's reproductive rights and health care options. Although neoliberalism calls for a privatization approach involving reduced state funding for and provision of *services*, the anti-abortion stances of American Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush have actually called for an increase in state involvement regarding reproductive health care *policies* in support of the Christian fundamentalist agenda of limiting sexuality and prohibiting contraceptive choice and safe, legal abortion.

This policy approach might be best explained by the rise in religious fundamentalism in relation to the economic restructuring of global capitalism or 'globalization'. Antrobus (2004) provides some reasons for this rise in religious fundamentalism: "...economic decline and insecurity cause people to seek the solace and certainty offered by religious fundamentalism (and) loss of access to jobs and essential services can push marginalized people to seek the assistance offered by religious groups" (p.71). She goes on to explain:

Fundamentalism exists in most religions, and the one thing they all have in common is control of women—especially women's sexuality—and the use of violence to impose this control. Violence is not only physical, but also psychological and even spiritual. Political power is reinforced when it can be linked to religious beliefs, and religious groups use political connections to protect their interests. (pp. 71-2)

Shazia Rafia, a spokesperson for Parliamentarians for Global Action, a network of over 1,300 legislators from 115 parliaments, explains, "Where women have opportunities, they tend to balance tradition with modernity, and form a bulwark against fundamentalism. That's why the first thing fundamentalists do is undermine women's freedoms" (Benen, 2004, p. 125).

Committee. After decades of being the world's biggest contributor of overseas development assistance in the post-war era, U.S. spending on international programs (aid not including military security or international affairs funding) has been cut almost in half when inflation is taken into account since the height of the Cold War in the mid-1980's (Cooper, 1996).

This religious fundamentalist-based political approach came boldly to the forefront of U.S. foreign policy in 1984 in the form of the 'Mexico City Policy' or the 'Global Gag Rule', as it is now termed by its opponents (and as I will refer to it in this paper). The Reagan administration-initiated policy, presented at the United Nations International Conference on Population in Mexico City, holds that foreign NGOs who accept U.S. family planning funding or supplies must agree to the following conditions: they cannot provide abortion services, even if they use their own, separate money; they cannot provide any information on abortion as an option for an unplanned pregnancy, including referrals for abortions; and they cannot advocate for changing the abortion laws in their own country, even if it is with separate funds.² The policy only applies to foreign NGOs who receive US aid, not foreign governments who receive the same aid. However, most of the recipients of US aid today are NGOs: by 2002, 75% of all US population assistance was provided through NGOs (Ethelston, et al, 2004, p. 133).

This is hardly a "hands off", free market approach to delivery of services. The Global Gag Rule has been in effect continuously since 1984, with the exception of the terms of President Bill Clinton, 1993-2000. U.S. family planning funding has not paid for abortions (domestically or internationally) in all but a few cases, since the Hyde Amendment prohibited such in 1977³. President Bill Clinton was able to overturn most of the tenets of the Global Gag Rule by executive order, but was unable to eliminate the Hyde Amendment, which is attached to Congressional appropriations

² U.S. NGOs can continue to perform, counsel, refer or advocate on abortion with funds from non-U.S. government sources without risking their eligibility to receive U.S. family planning assistance. The only requirement imposed on U.S. NGOs by the Mexico City Policy restrictions is the responsibility to enforce the policy on their foreign NGO partners (Population Action International, 2006).

³ The Hyde Amendment, passed by Congress in 1976, excludes federal funding of abortions for low-income women receiving healthcare through the Medicaid program. The Amendment presently includes an exception for cases of rape or incest, or when a woman's life is endangered. Individual states can fund abortions for low-income women for broader circumstances. Currently, only 17 states do so, while 1 state fails to comply with the Hyde Amendment by providing coverage only for lifesaving abortions. The same restrictions as those in the Hyde Amendment also currently apply to Native Americans, federal employees and their dependents, Peace Corps volunteers, low-income Washington, DC residents, federal prisoners, military personnel and their dependents, Medicaid recipients who are HMO members, Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) recipients, and disabled women on Medicare. While Medicaid funding does not pay for most abortions, it does pay for prenatal care, childbirth, neonatal care, and pediatric care if a woman chooses to carry her pregnancy to term (ACLU, 2004).

bills, mainly because there was a Republican-controlled Congress throughout the majority of his tenure.

In this paper, I provide an analysis of how the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) movement has responded to the administration of George W. Bush in regard to international family planning funding. I especially consider the world's geo-political climate during the time period of 2001 to the present, examining the ways in which the movement has been affected by its forces during this era. I argue that policies such as the Global Gag Rule have been especially effective for U.S. conservatives promoting Christian religious fundamentalism because these policies only affect foreign NGOs, which have now become the primary reproductive health care providers in the Third World after nation states have abandoned government health services.⁴

After twelve years of conservative Republican administrations from 1980-1992, the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) movement seemed to make great strides by helping to elect Clinton (1993-2000), who nullified the Gag Rule, increased international family planning funding, and agreed to landmark international SRHR charters such as the 'Cairo Consensus' formed at the 1994 U.N. International Conference on Population and Development⁵. However, from the start of the George W. Bush administration in 2001, many of these marks of progress were erased by a new Republican President. I specifically examine the ways in which the SRHR movement has tried to advance sexual and reproductive health and rights during the time of an administration hostile to its goals.

⁴ When the Global Gag Rule was originally enacted in 1984, a larger proportion of services were provided by government agencies which were not subjected to the Gag Rule, thereby impacting a smaller number of women. Now, a vast majority of women seek their reproductive health care through an NGO; many of these women are subjected to the Global Gag Rule because USAID is still the largest bilateral funding source for reproductive health services in low-income countries (Center for Reproductive Rights, 2003). By 2002, 75% of all US population assistance was provided through NGOs (Ethelston, et al, 2004, p. 133).

⁵ The UN International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) held in Cairo, Egypt in 1994, is viewed as a crucial turning point for those in the SRHR movement. The conference and its programme, or agenda for future action, represented a monumental paradigm shift from old population control programs to a rights-based framework. The Cairo programme, which was agreed to by a record 179 countries, including the US, calls for universal access to reproductive health care by 2015. Although the programme did not demand universal legal abortion, it did make a ground-breaking call for addressing the public health consequences of unsafe abortion and ensuring that where abortion is legal it is safe.

Theoretical Perspective

Some scholars as well as activists see the neoliberal, free-market aspects of globalization as opportunities for communities to govern themselves from the bottom up (Grown, 2005, Hart-Landsberg, 2006, STWR, 2006, WGNRR, 2004). They argue that a decline in state-run services will lead to less bureaucracy, less waste, and a market where the best product or service wins out due to the 'purchasing' choices made by individuals. However, many more view neoliberalism as a kind of free-market 'fundamentalism' connected to the rise in religious and other fundamentalisms, one which has extreme effects on people's lives, especially their ability to make individual choices appropriate for them and their families (Antrobus, 2004, STWR, 2006, WGNRR, 2004). The International Women's Movement and the SRHR movement have argued that the impacts are especially negative and severe for women. The 2005-2006 Global Health Watch report notes, "The fundamentalism of the market joins the fundamentalisms of ethnic, religious, and moral right-wing groups in dismantling women's livelihoods, economic security, and control over women's bodies" (p. 138).

The international women's movement has reacted to globalization and neoliberalism in a predominantly negative way, feeling that their mandates, structures, and impacts are counterproductive to women's well-being and empowerment. I am defining the International Women's Movement here as a large collection of individuals, groups, and local, regional, national, and international women's organizations who work for an end to patriarchal privilege and control through both inherently political activities and socially transformative organizations that meet the needs of women and their families (Antrobus, 2004). The Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) Movement is a sub-set of the International Women's Movement, consisting of the same types of individuals and groups, but those who are focused specifically on advancing women's access to sexual and reproductive health and rights. Many of these groups are NGOs and/or political organizations that may provide direct health services, education, research, policy, or lobbying activities, such as the Center for Reproductive Rights, Engender Health, Ipas, the International Planned Parenthood Federation, Pathfinder International, and Population Action International.

In this paper, I use both the political process (McAdam, 1982, McAdam, et al, 1996) and social movement literature (Benford and Snow, 2000, Rein and Schon, 1991, Tarrow, 2001, 1998) to develop an approach that examines how the SRHR Movement has responded to the Bush administration's actions regarding international family planning policies and funding. The macro-level political economy that the SRHR movement has operated under during the Bush era has involved a world

deeply impacted by globalization, neoliberalism, and religious fundamentalism. Neoliberalist policies have called for privatization of health services coupled with reduced public funding for such services (Antrobus, 2004, Crane, 2005, Grown, 2005, WGNRR, 2004). Religious fundamentalism has grown and flourished both domestically and internationally during the Bush era (Bass, 2001, Benen, 2004, Kort. Kranish, 2006), impacting the SRHR movement in a variety of ways, from an ideological shift against SRHR to funding being diverted to 'faith-based organizations' who promote abstinence only in lieu of family planning. Combine these two phenomena with a globalizing world and the impact of their agendas affects more women than ever (Buss and Herman, 2003, Chappell, 2006, People's Health Movement, 2005).

Two components of political process theory (McAdam, 1982, McAdam. et al, 1996) that come into play after the broader, macro-level environment (of globalization, neoliberalism, and religious fundamentalism in this case) is considered are *political opportunity structures* and *framing*. Political opportunity structures encompass the general *context* that a movement operates within. Tarrow (1998) defines political opportunity structures as:

consistent—but not necessarily formal or permanent—dimensions of the political environment that provide incentives for collective action by affecting people's expectations for success or failure (pp. 76-77).

Political opportunity structures are divided into three sub-categories: 1) "access to institutions, 2) presence of influential allies, and 3) changes in political alignments and conflicts" (Joachim, 2003, p. 247), all of which are components that affect the success and/or failure of the movement's agenda. My analysis includes: an examination of the access, or lack of access to institutions that the SRHR movement has experienced; the presence of influential opponents and allies that the SRHR movement has or has not had during the Bush era; and the various changes in political alignments and conflicts that have improved or worsened the SRHR movement's cause. Several scholars (Chappell, 2006, Joachim, 2003) have utilized the concept of political opportunity structure in their examination of the conditions favorable to the emergence of a social movement. I will be looking at how unfavorable conditions, or political opportunity structures, have impacted an existing social movement.

Secondly, I examined the tactics and strategies the SRHR movement has utilized during the Bush era, employing interviews with key NGO actors to provide a firsthand accounting. One component of the movement's tactics lie in the 'framing' of their issues. As defined by Snow (in McAdam, 1996) frames are "(T)he conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action" (p. 6). Framing processes "provide a perspective from which an amorphous, ill-defined and

problematic situation can be made sense of and acted upon" (Rein and Schon, p. 263). Located within the political process framework, the concept of framing (Benford and Snow, 2000) illustrates how the SRHR Movement has 'framed' their issues in response to the limiting nature of the Bush administration. For example, in the case of the SRHR movement, the central actors in the 1990's framed SRHR as a 'rights' issue whereas in today's much more conservative, anti-abortion Bush era, they have framed their issues in 'softer', healthcare-oriented terms such as promoting "safe motherhood" or reducing "maternal mortality". In my conclusion, I re-visit the literature to provide an analysis of the movement in relation to these concepts from political process and social movement theory.

Thesis Statement

The Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) Movement has existed in an ever-changing world of globalization, politics, needs, and resources, exemplified by the great changes that have occurred during the George W. Bush era. The movement responded to this administration in a variety of ways, some of which have been successful and some of which have been defensive at best. In this paper, I ask the questions: How has the SRHR movement responded to the Bush administration in regard to international family planning funding and rights policies? And, specifically, how has the worsening political environment of the Bush era and its unfavorable political opportunity structures impacted the SRHR movement and in what ways has the movement responded? A review of the literature finds that there are no comprehensive studies analyzing the SRHR movement and its interactions with the Bush administration regarding U.S. international family planning funding and policies. Conducting such an analysis can help us to understand the grave effects that the macro-level environment of neoliberalism, globalization, and religious fundamentalism (as well as a particular U.S. President's influence) have had on a movement struggling to protect and provide for the SRHR of women around the world.

Literature Review

There is a great deal of literature concerning international Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) since the landmark UN population and women's conferences of the 1990's (Crane, 2005, Crossette, 2005, Kort, 2004, WGNRR, 2004). Literature concerning the specifics of political stances, policies, and funding decisions of the Bush administrations exists, but as specific issue studies only (Benen, 2004, Bishop, 2004, Crane and Dusenberry, 2004, Hwang, 2002). A large

amount of this literature can be found in scholarly journals; however, there is also a great deal to be found in publications by the UN and NGOs as well as in books (Feldt, 2004, Michelman, 2005, Page, 2006), popular media, and Congressional reports. There is a sizeable amount of literature linking the politics of neoliberalism and the process of globalization to women's and health issues (Barton, 2005, Grown, 2005, People's Health Movement/Global Health Watch, 2005, WGNRR, 2004). A final category under this umbrella involves the literature on the impact of religious fundamentalism on SRHR (Benen, 2004, Buss and Herman, 2003, Chappell, 2006, Hinrichsen, 2004). However, there does not seem to be any comprehensive analyses of the Bush administration in regard to international SRHR funding and policies that both consider the broader geo-political elements of his time and the political opportunity structures in place in regard to the SRHR movement. My review of the literature starts with analyses of how the macro-level elements of globalization, neoliberalism, and religious fundamentalism have impacted SRHR and goes on to identify critiques of the SRHR movement since Cairo, research on Bush administration SRHR policies, and ideas on how the SRHR movement might proceed into the future.

Several scholars are now analyzing and critiquing the SRHR movement in light of the broader macro-level environment of globalization, neoliberalism, and religious fundamentalism. In 2004 and 2005 reports respectively, the Women's Global Network on Reproductive Rights (WGNRR) and the Global Health Watch assessed women's health in a free market economy since the instrumental Cairo U.N. Population Conference in 1994, identifying several key processes that affect women's SRHR, including: "The negative impacts of neoliberal economic policies on women's health generally" and "the restriction of women's rights due to such policies in combination with religious fundamentalisms" (WGNRR, 2004, p. 2). Both the WGNRR and the Global Health Watch contend that a problem of the SRHR movement since Cairo has been that "many women's rights activists lobbying a decade ago (in 1994) for reproductive and sexual rights did not, in short, pay sufficient attention to the structural and macroeconomic conditions for those rights" (WGNRR, 2004, p. 18). The authors of the Global Health Watch (2005) maintain that the Cairo conference attendees and the final document did not take into account the enormous "power imbalances in economic and social structures among and between countries and between men and women" (p. 138). Crane (2005) contends that the endeavors of the SRHR movement are particularly handicapped by the 'compromise language' of the Cairo Programme which states, "In circumstances where abortion is not against the law, such abortion should be safe" (p. 86). Crane explains that adherence to the ICPD compromise language by international actors

“effectively leaves many women without care in countries where restrictive laws remain in place” (2005, p. 87).

Both the WGNRR (2004) briefing and the Global Health Watch report (2005) point to a backlash to Cairo’s Programme of Action and a rise in religious and ethnic fundamentalisms as a result of the extreme economic fundamentalism of neoliberalism. “At ground level”, says Brazilian reproductive rights researcher and activist Sonia Correa, the growth and violence of traditional fundamentalisms are “directly related to the outcomes of market-oriented globalization” (WGNRR, 2004, p. 18). The literature also significantly points to other ways in which fundamentalist forces have been able to join with the US government to restrict not only abortion, but many other SRHR. George W. Bush joined with religious fundamentalists when he was inaugurated in 2001 to re-impose the GGR and stop payment of the US’s \$34 million annual contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in 2002. The Bush administration went on to call for “all language referring to reproductive health services, reproductive rights, and sexual health in the Cairo Programme to be removed” (WGNRR, p. 19).

The Global Health Watch (2005) and the WGNRR (2004) explore the connections between the latter-century movement from government provision of health care services to private and World Bank-led funding and provision of services that saw health care not as a right or a need, but as a consumer demand or ‘want’. Crane (2005) specifically examined the omission of sexual and reproductive health rights in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and calls for a strategic response by the SRHR movement to focus on issues of global economic justice. Crane (2005) reports that “Some critics have argued that the MDGs are so much a product of the neoliberal agenda that there is little to be gained by working within that framework; others argue for greater efforts to bring in feminist and human rights perspectives” (p. 85). In regard to safe abortion, Crane (2005) maintains, “Even the SRHR movement’s willingness to advocate for safe abortion care is influenced by the overall dependency of key actors on U.S. resources, whose decisions in turn are often governed by conservative forces that include entrenched corporate interests and religious ideologies” (p.86).

Several authors locate the problems with lack of international family planning funding and restrictive policies squarely within the realm of the Bush administration. Most of the focus on Bush is due to his reinstatement of the Global Gag Rule and its damaging consequences to women. Hwang (2002) maintains that the U.S. government is actively discouraging international and national-level efforts to realize women’s rights to safe abortion care by such measures as restricting family planning and development funding (because they are the single largest development and humanitarian aid donor government and often the single largest funder of

international organizations) and by attaching explicit or implicit conditions (including the GGR) to their funding and endorsement of executive appointments to international agencies.

Most of the scholars researching and reporting on the GGR are incredulous that a policy that would be a first amendment violation in the US would be initiated and enforced by our government elsewhere. Crane and Dusenberry (2004) maintain that the Global Gag Rule “violates the norms that the great majority of the international community have come to believe should govern donor-recipient relationships as well as the US government’s own stated commitments to promoting civil society and women’s human rights in overseas development assistance” (p. 129). Crane and Dusenberry also argue that the GGR “sets a dangerous policy precedent by interfering with the autonomy and private decision-making of NGOs and violating medical ethics and the human rights of pregnant women and health professionals” (2004, p. 129). The United States had long been a leader in development assistance and family planning, helping to create the UNFPA in the 1960’s and acting as major proponents of the Cairo programme agreed to by 179 countries in 1994. Hwang (2002) argues that “(the reinstatement of the GGR by Bush) put the United States in a peculiar diplomatic position: while formally committed to the Cairo programme of action, the US is in effect using its economic power to undermine the human rights principle upon which the programme is built” (p. 2). Others wonder about the effect of US policy on the international donor community. Crane (2005) notes, “...the contrast is striking between directions the international community was taking on SRHR issues in the 1990s, when U.S. policy was more liberal, and the current situation” (p. 87).

Many SRHR researchers are being more pro-active in researching and documenting the effects of the Global Gag Rule than they were during its first phase of 1984-1992. Crane and Dusenberry (2004) argue that policies such as the GGR are more damaging now than when they were first introduced two decades ago. They note that the Gag Rule “appears to be the cause of more internal contradictions within the reproductive health community and a cause of conflict involving NGOs, governments, donor agencies, and others” (p. 131). Crane and Dusenberry maintain that this damage is due to: both more NGOs rejecting US funding because of the GGR as well as more NGOs agreeing to adhere to the GGR to receive US funding; more countries permitting abortions, laws that basically conflict with the GGR and unduly restrict NGOs operating in that country; more focus since Cairo on provision of safe abortion services, another measure that is prohibited by the GGR; the integration of reproductive health services with other service provision, such as for HIV/AIDS, that would severely impact an NGO who refused US funding because of the GGR; and the limits applied to USAID programs to promote an active post-

abortion care program while working with both non-GGR NGOs and those that adhere to the GGR.

Crane and Dusenberry (2004) insist that the harmful effects of the Global Gag Rule must be determined in a country-by-country analysis:

In each country, the effects are determined by the political economy of reproductive health in that country—including how large a role is played by NGOs in both services and advocacy, the presence of other reproductive health donors, the salience of abortion as a privacy issue, and the commitment of the national government to reproductive health (p. 131).

Hwang (2002) notes that, “In developing countries that permit abortion, the rule has the bizarre effect of preventing counselors from discussing a procedure allowed by law...” (p.4).

Crane (2005), Crane and Dusenberry (2004), and the Global Health Watch (2005), among others, argue for a linkage between related arenas and the fight against the GGR and for broader SRHR for better outcomes. These authors argue that the SRHR movement can benefit by linking with related movements (such as HIV/AIDS, maternal and child health, humanitarian response, anti-poverty, development, and human rights) to devise holistic approaches to the issues that will better reflect and meet the needs of all those involved. Crane (2005) contends that fundamentalist forces are at work dismantling SRHR in these other arenas and that the SRHR movement needs to pay attention and get involved. The Global Health Watch (2005) authors offer seven specific recommendations for future action for the SRHR movement: “strengthen the human rights framework; work in alliances for economic and social justice; fight against fundamentalisms; support policies for greater bodily integrity; hold donors, governments, and institutions to account; measure progress; and produce better research” (pp. 144-5). Although successes have been few and far between during the Bush era, according to these scholars, there are some gains to be had. Crane and Dusenberry (2004) point to the example of the Bush administration deciding in 2003 to not extend the GGR to HIV/AIDS funding, which, according to the authors, “...underscore(d) the lack of strong support for the Gag Rule when other values (were) seen to be at stake” (p. 130). Crane (2005) sees hope for combating the GGR in actions such as the advancement of medical/pharmaceutical abortion, especially after the World Health Organization recently resisted U.S. government pressure to ban (pharmaceutical abortion) medications from their Essential Medicines list after SRHR leaders had worked hard to advance the issue.

There is a significant amount of literature regarding SRHR since the UN Cairo Conference, US spending on international family planning, and SRHR in relation to the broader macroeconomic world of the new millennium. There is also a fair

amount of information detailing the Bush administration's stances, policies, and funding decisions regarding SRHR internationally, but it is almost always set in a discussion of one specific SRHR issue or another. There does not seem to be any comprehensive analyses of the funding and policy decisions of the Bush administration in regard to international family planning funding and policies and how the SRHR movement has responded to the administration's actions. This case study enables me to focus on how the unfavorable political opportunity structures of the Bush era have impacted the SRHR movement's tactics and strategies. This study is helpful because so few studies have examined the effect of unfavorable political opportunity structures on an existing movement.

Methodology

I have conducted a case study analysis of how the SRHR movement has responded to the Bush Administration's opposition to the movement's agenda. Gerring (2004) defines a case study as "an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of units" (p. 341-2). Gerring (2004) goes on to say that a unit "connotes a spatially bound phenomenon...observed at a single point in time or over some delimited period of time" (p. 342). In this instance, the SRHR movement is the unit I am studying, during the time of the Bush administration. The variables, or dimensions, I will examine within this study are: the Bush administration; the United Nations; the Right-to-Life Movement; private foundations; other donor governments; pro-choice congresspersons; and central SRHR movement actor NGOs. The larger class of units I am seeking to understand are existing social movements within a world of negative or mainly closed political opportunity structures. Case studies are helpful because they focus on an extensive amount of information (the variables or dimensions noted above) in regard to very few units or cases, in this instance, the SRHR movement during the Bush era. A case study allows me to provide an in-depth analysis of my topic area. Case studies "(H)elp researchers connect the micro level, or the actions of individual people (in this instance the SRHR movement), to the macro level, or large-scale social structures and processes (in this instance the political opportunity structures of the Bush era and the macroeconomic global environment)" (Vaughan, 1992 in Neuman, 2006, p. 41).

In this analysis, I utilized information from scholarly journals, studies by and reports from the UN and international NGOs, Congressional reports, U.S. funding reports, popular media, books, and websites to support my thesis. I supplement this information with firsthand accounts of the movement's tactics and strategies utilized during the Bush era. These accounts were gathered from phone interviews I conducted with three NGOs who are key actors in the SRHR movement. The phone

interviews lasted one half to one and one half hours and were conducted in August of 2007. The three NGOs interviewed were: Ipas; Pathfinder International; and Population Action International. I have also provided an integrated analysis of the effects of neoliberalism and globalization during the Bush era, the subsequent rise in religious fundamentalisms, and their effects on the international SRHR movement.

Thesis Structure

My thesis begins with this introductory chapter detailing the central issues of the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) movement in regard to international family planning funding during the administration of President George W. Bush. I discuss the theoretical framework I used to analyze the issue and provide an analysis of the current scholarly literature in relation to my topic area. I also describe the methodology I used during my study and identify the central actors examined from the SRHR movement.

Chapter two provides an in-depth analysis of the political opportunity structures in place during the Bush era, relating them to the SRHR movement and specifically US international family planning funding and policies during that time period. This includes a detailed analysis of the changes in political alignments and conflicts that came to be during the administration, such as the induction of a new, anti-choice religious fundamentalist administration under the direction of George W. Bush. I describe the movement's (lack of) access to institutions during the Bush administration, intertwining the impacts of religious fundamentalisms, neoliberalism, and globalization on the UN, the Bush administration, and SRHR donors. I go on to provide an in-depth analysis of all of the movement's influential opponents (ie; the Bush administration and the "Right to Life" movement) and allies (ie; private foundations, other donor countries, and pro-choice congresspersons) in place during this time period.

In the third chapter, I examine the movement's action strategies and tactics. Framing processes are identified and related to the larger political economy of the era, including the increasing focus on globalization, neoliberalism, and religious fundamentalisms. I identify the tactics the movement utilized during this era, including those employed in the international arena (such as at UN meetings and conferences and in the field) and those utilized within the US (such as at Congressional hearings or appropriations bills challenges). I also provide a firsthand account of the activities of key actors within the SRHR movement during the time as well as the movement's interactions with funders, policy makers, and researchers.

In chapter four, I examine the movement's achievements, ongoing challenges, and outlook for the future. For example, what tactics and strategies has the

movement utilized even in a time of extremely negative political opportunity structures, and how effective were they? How has the change in the US Congress to pro-choice, Democratic control in 2007 impacted the movement's goals and objectives? Finally, I examine issues that may have significant impacts on the future of the SRHR movement in regard to international family planning funding (new administrations, new technologies, and work at the UN).

CHAPTER 2

POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES

This chapter explores the setting in which the Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) movement has operated within during the George W. Bush era. In the social movement literature, the political context in which a movement operates within is referred to as the political opportunity structure, a concept that emphasizes the opening up and closing down of a social movement's opportunities for action within a particular political context (Tarrow, 1998, McAdam, et al, 1996). The political opportunity structures that have existed during the Bush era, that I will define and describe in this chapter, have very strongly shaped the tactics, strategies, and responses that the SRHR movement has utilized, which I will explore in the next chapter. In regard to political opportunity structures, I will be following the political process framework (Tarrow, 2001, 1998, McAdam, et al, 1996, Davis, et al, 2005) by defining and describing three key components for this study: changes in political alignments and conflicts; access to institutions; and influential allies and opponents.

A strongly conservative, patriarchal, religious fundamentalist worldview from both the administration itself and on the international stage has forced the SRHR movement to operate in a predominantly reactive nature. Changes in political alignments and conflicts have had a significant impact on the movement's goals, from George W. Bush's election and the Iraq war, to the continuing effects of neo-liberalism and globalization. In the Bush era, as opposed to the SRHR-friendly Clinton era, the movement has had a massively decreased amount of access to institutions, from significant negative changes at the UN to Bush's disdain for the UN, its politics, and its agreements. During this era, those in the SRHR movement have encountered more influential opponents than they have allies, with the traditional "Right to Life" movement joining forces with the SRHR movement's most influential opponent, the Bush administration. Allies have remained, and even expanded in some cases, in spite of national and international changes and include pro-choice congresspersons, private donor foundations, and other donor countries. This chapter will explore these elements of political opportunity structures at length in order to describe and illuminate the setting the SRHR movement has operated within during the Bush era.

Changes in Political Alignments

The first political opportunity structure component I have examined in regard to the SRHR movement during the Bush era revolves around changes in political alignments or conflicts. The end of the Clinton era brought the new anti-choice, anti-family planning administration of George W. Bush into the White House, and with it renewed challenges to the SRHR movement. Each January of his presidency, on the anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* decision legalizing abortion, George W. Bush has spoken to the anti-choice protestors gathered in Washington to commemorate the date and lend his support. He has said that he shares their commitment to "protect the lives of innocent children waiting to be born" (Toner, 2003) and has pushed for domestic and international policies that support that agenda. NARAL Pro-Choice America reports, "On his first working day in office in January, 2001, President George W. Bush ordered the reinstatement of the Global Gag Rule on international family planning programs: programs that strive to prevent unintended pregnancy, reduce abortion, and avert hundreds of thousands of infant and maternal deaths worldwide each year (NARAL, 2007a, p. 13)." The US, as well as the U.N., does not provide funding for abortions anywhere in the world. The political conflicts arising from an administration like that of George W. Bush have to do with *access* to abortion services and funding of and access to family planning (contraceptive) services. Because the administration is not able to stop abortions altogether by not funding them, it tries to do so by limiting women's *access* to abortion services by attaching conditions to their family planning funding so that reproductive health care providers cannot also perform abortions (with other monies). Ironically, the administration has at the same time limited the reach of the Global Gag Rule by significantly reducing its international family planning funding, services which would, in fact, reduce the number of abortions. These policies have created a firestorm in the international community and at the UN and have alienated the US from its traditional allies and partners in family planning assistance, with whom the US had enjoyed good relations dating back to the 1960's.

Access to Institutions

The second component of the political opportunity structure that the SRHR movement operated within during the Bush era is in regard to their access to institutions. After enjoying eight years of relatively open access to a pro-choice President, State Department, and USAID during the Clinton era, the SRHR movement has had to deal with a "closed door" scenario with the Bush administration. Even the UN, the setting that the movement worked so hard to secure

access to throughout the Clinton era, especially in regard to SRHR, has become a hostile environment to both women's and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights. The landmark Cairo programme adopted in 1994 has been repeatedly attacked, especially by religious fundamentalists at the UN, which have included Bush administration officials. George W. Bush has distanced himself from prior US (and SRHR movement) allies with his agenda of religious fundamentalism mixed with neo-liberalism and globalization. Where actors in the SRHR movement had enjoyed a large amount of success at and access to the UN during the Clinton era, they now had to fight for every bit of access and encountered a backlash to their earlier gains. This all occurred in a time of increased globalization, privatization, and spreading neo-liberalism that took the focus away from human rights and moved it to a market-based system of service delivery, often neglecting the poor women and children in developing countries who need services such as health care the most. In addition to these forces, the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 led to an increased focus and spending on terrorism and security, which also diverted attention away from women's rights.

Religious Fundamentalists at the UN

After the United Nations-friendly Clinton administration came to a close, conservative forces at the UN, including certain UN member countries, were gearing up to turn back the clock on SRHR that the liberal US administration had advanced in the 1990's in partnership with the international SRHR movement. The ideology that these conservative countries all have in common is one of religious fundamentalism that limits women's rights, whether it comes from a Protestant evangelical Christian (US), Catholic (the Vatican, Ecuador, Nicaragua, etc.), or Islamic (Iran, Syria, Libya, and Pakistan, among others) background. This partnership has been referred to by the international women's movement and scholars as an 'unholy alliance' because of its various dichotomies of partnering of West with East and military enemies with religious fundamentalist allies (Chappell, 2006).

At UN conferences and agency and General Assembly meetings, the formerly domestically-focused (US) "Religious Right" has been able to export their Protestant evangelical Christian fundamentalist agenda by partnering with the Bush administration and fundamentalist Islamic and Catholic organizations and countries to limit or eliminate international SRHR under this so-called 'unholy alliance'. Benen (2004) reports, "By collaborating with the Bush administration and Islamic and Catholic allies, the Religious Right has turned its US 'culture war' into an international battle that impacts families around the world" (p. 122). These impacts have come at UN meetings and conferences in the form of actions such as stalling

tactics, opposition to previously-agreed upon commitments, and limiting language and actions in new documents (Chappell, 2006). The partnerships between religious fundamentalists and military opponents seem particularly ironic during a 'Global War on Terrorism'. Adrienne Germaine, President of the International Women's Health Coalition, told the *Washington Post*, "This alliance shows the depths of perversity of the (US) position. On the one hand we're presumably blaming these countries for unspeakable acts of terrorism, and at the same time we are allying ourselves with them in the oppression of women" (Benen, 2004, p. 125-6).

Those within the SRHR movement are concerned about the Bush administration's alliance with the Religious Right and fundamentalist countries because the US, as the foremost 'superpower' in the world, has a tremendous influence at the UN, and on international policy and funding in particular. When even a small, fanatical religious alliance has the support of one of the most powerful countries in the world, the outcome can be dangerous. Benen (2004) reports that this alliance can "...dictate the outcome of several policy debates..." in regard to SRHR and women's rights, as is reported at length in the following sections on Bush's influence at the UN and UN changes in population assistance. Perhaps one of the most damaging effects this 'unholy alliance' has had on the SRHR movement at the UN is the 'defensive position' Chappell (2006) reports that the movement has been kept in, making it difficult to both maintain current rights agreements and expand on their agenda.

The SRHR movement became so wary of the hostile environment at the UN that key actors elected to downplay the 10th anniversary conference of the Beijing International Women's Conference in 2005 due to "the rise of religious fundamentalism...and the internationalization of political conservatism", which they felt might allow "governments to back out of previous commitments and ultimately wind back women's rights" (Chappell, 2006, p. 518). Indeed, the US played the leading role in trying to turn back the clock on the agreements made at the original Beijing conference by trying to "reopen and amend the programme to include the statement that the document does not confer any international legal rights or legally binding obligations on states under international law" (Chappell, 2006, p. 503). However, the US delegation was ultimately unsuccessful and unpopular amongst the majority of the delegations, who are not part of the 'unholy alliance'. Most of the American public is unaware of the changes that happen on the UN stage in relation to SRHR. As Kort (2004) reports, "The decisions the US government makes (in regard to international SRHR) are not widely reported, and they're in areas that are very technical and complicated, so programs are being eliminated and no one knows about this" (p. 119).

Amy Coen, of the NGO Population Action International (PAI), is one of those in the movement that are extremely concerned about the 'unholy alliance' between conservative, fundamentalist and/or anti-choice groups and religious groups with like-minded governments. PAI's concerns lie in the impacts on both women internationally and in the US from this type of a coalition. She says, "It appears that this (Bush) administration tests things abroad first, and that's what we're worried about" (in Kort, 2004, p. 119). The 'unholy alliance' and Christian Right UN activists have even been able to find friends in the once off-limits liberal European landscape. Opposition to SRHR in Europe has intensified and has even shown up in complaints to the European Commission, whom anti-choice activists have now branded as "promoting abortion" for their support of SRHR (Ethelston, et al, 2004, p. 12). Wanda Nowicka of the Federation for Women and Family Planning in Warsaw told the Village Voice, "We used to be able to say, 'Look at those progressive countries like the US.' But now I'm afraid...progress is headed in a different direction" (in Benen, 2004, p. 128).

Bush, SRHR, the UN and International Policy

While working to oppose women's and SRHR at the UN in support of a conservative social agenda, the administration of George W. Bush became increasingly antagonistic toward the UN in regard to military and security issues after the UN rejected Bush's unilateral military response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks by invading Iraq. The Bush administration has found its few military and diplomatic allies in countries like England and Canada and identified enemies in Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, and the Sudan, some of whom Bush identified as 'the axis of evil'. Paradoxically, even after September 11, the Bush administration has partnered with these so-called 'enemies' in its opposition to SRHR, part of the fundamentalist alliance's larger campaign against women's rights (Benen, 2004, p. 122).

Since the beginning of George W. Bush's terms in 2001, his administration has repeatedly tried to turn back the clock on SRHR in the international community by sending conservative, anti-choice and/or fundamentalist representatives to international meetings and conferences and empowering them to object to SRHR, block their inclusion in agreements, and/or back out of previously agreed upon commitments (Ethelston, et al, 2004). One international agreement that the Bush administration has been particularly active in trying to destabilize is the Cairo Programme of Action. The UNFPA notes, "Currently, the most significant U.N. document (on reproductive health and rights and population) is the Programme of Action resulting from the International Conference on Population and Development, held in Cairo in 1994, which forms the blueprint for reproductive health policy

around the world. One hundred and seventy-nine governments (including the US) adopted the Cairo Programme of Action by consensus. All but a handful are fully committed to its principles and recommendations" (UNFPA, 2007). The US, under George W. Bush, is one of those handfuls of countries that are not committed to the Cairo Programme, going against the agreement made by our government in 1994, while Clinton was in office. The Cairo programme was an agreed-upon plan for achieving universal access to basic reproductive health care by 2015, with a budget laid out for both donors and developing nations. The U.S., from the introduction of the Republican-controlled Congress in 1994 to the current Bush administration now in 2007, has not met its financial obligations agreed to in the Cairo programme. Although the U.S. is the largest donor in dollar terms, they contributed just one-third of their 'fair share' of the 2005 spending goal agreed to in the Cairo programme (Ethelston, et al, 2004).

In 2002, the Bush administration sent an anti-abortion and anti-family planning delegation to the Asian and Pacific Population Conference in Bangkok where they insisted that the Cairo language of reproductive health and rights were code words for abortion. The US contingent forced a vote on its objections and was the only country to vote for a change in the language (Bishop, 2004, Kort, 2004). At a 2002 UN meeting on the rights of children, intended to create a new document entitled, *A World Fit for Children*, the Bush administration delegation included representatives from anti-choice, anti-family planning groups such as the Family Research Council, Concerned Women for America, a Virginia private Christian school, along with the Vatican. The American delegation teamed with fundamentalist Islamic countries including Syria, Libya, and Pakistan to make sure that the word "services" was not included in the document. The document endorsed young people's *access* to reproductive health, but no *services* to ensure they have it (Benen, 2004).

A similar approach to international SRHR by the Bush administration occurred in April 2004 when, NARAL Pro-Choice America reports,

Succumbing to political pressure from anti-choice activists... the Bush administration abruptly ended a 30-year tradition of federal funding for a prominent Public health conference hosted by the nonpartisan Global Health Council. Federal support was rescinded because organizations with pro-choice positions were among the conference's diverse participants. The conference included perspectives on youth health issues from a range of groups, and (as is often the case) some speakers had positions that differ from President Bush's in the area of reproductive health. Now, however, the president appears to be subjecting an event's speakers to an ideological

litmus test, and by doing so, is crippling efforts to disseminate information on important public health issues.

One of the most worrisome aspects of the Bush administration's reversals of US support for international family planning comes in the effect it has on our former allies on SRHR. A former US official, speaking anonymously to the *Los Angeles Times*, said in 2002, "The US position on health issues and international instruments has been so combative and isolationist we've ended up alienating traditional friends, especially Europeans" (in Benen. 2004, p. 124). At a UNFPA Board Meeting in June 2004, European Commissioner of Development and Humanitarian Aid Poul Nielson stated, "I must say here that I have been extremely dismayed by the actions of the United States in refusing to fund UNFPA and in attempting to undermine the Cairo consensus. Here we had the country that championed the founding of UNFPA now spurning it. Added to this, we have official support for so-called abstinence programmes and negative and factually wrong messages about condoms, which will only serve to worsen reproductive health in developing countries through increasing unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted infections (Nielson, 2004, p. 2)."

UN Changes in Population Assistance

The UN has become increasingly conservative in response to globalization and neo-liberalism's effects on development and population assistance in general since the landmark 1994 Cairo SRHR agreement. Since Cairo, the new buzzwords at the UN have been heavily influenced by the spread of neo-liberalism, exemplified in terminology such as "poverty reduction" and "health sector reform", rather than "sexual and reproductive health care" or "women's rights" or even "human rights". At the turn of the millennium, the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were drafted as a new blueprint for development assistance to offer "precise targets for reducing poverty and promoting global development" (PAI, 2005). Giffard and Van Leuven (2005) report,

For the first time, international leaders had committed themselves to a worldwide campaign encompassing eight specific goals and with an absolute deadline. The MDGs are the first truly global effort to eradicate poverty. If the MDGs are successfully implemented by the year 2015, the projected benefits are staggering: 30 million children will not die before the age of five; more than 300 million will not suffer from hunger; more than 500 million people will not live in extreme poverty; 350 million fewer people will be without safe drinking water; and 650 million fewer people will live without basic sanitation measures. Each goal has its own set of targets and

benchmarks that offer a measurable way to track its implementation. The MDGs are a mandate for developing countries to shape policies and strengthen their own governance. More wealthy countries are asked to increase aid, relieve debt, and give poor countries fair access to their markets and technology (p. 2).

By 2001, when the MDGs were adopted and presented, many women's groups were dismayed that only one goal had limited specificity to gender equality (goal 3, in regard to education only) and none explicitly addressed reproductive rights (Barton, 2005, People's Health Movement, 2005). The Global Health Watch reports,

The goals exclude sexuality, reproductive rights, and health as determinants of gender equality, and focus on education for girls and maternal health and morbidity. This places women and children's right to health within a purely biological framework (People's Health Movement, 2005, pp. 136-137).

DAWN, or Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era, a Southern-hemisphere-based NGO that has been a central actor in the SRHR movement before and since Cairo, goes on to explain,

(T)he absence of other reproductive health and rights concerns (in the MDGs) reflects the UN's reluctance to recognize or take a strong stand on other (SRHR) issues in many arenas, particularly women's autonomy to choose, abortion, and sexuality (in People's Health Movement, 2005, p. 137).

Many in the SRHR movement were caught off guard by this crucial omission and were forced to look inward for reasons why they had 'dropped the ball' on both the MDGs and family planning assistance in general. Steven Sinding, Director General of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, said at a 2003 international conference on how reproductive health is being dealt with in the agendas of donor nations; "Sexual and reproductive health and rights as a development theme have fallen away from the center of the international development agenda." (Crossette, 2005, p. 77)

Changes at UNFPA during the new millennium would also spell doom for many of the SRHR movement's efforts, especially in regard to the MDGs and the Cairo programme. Several of those in the movement have argued that UNFPA was not in a strong lobbying position at the time and 'dropped the ball' on the MDGs (Crossette, 2005). UNFPA's Executive Director, Nafis Sadik, had resigned in 2000, a crucial time for the Beijing+5 conference and the MDGs. UNFPA had met such major resistance from religious fundamentalists at the Cairo+5 conference in 1999 that the General Assembly did not support a Cairo+10 meeting in 2004 (Crossette, 2005). The new UNFPA Director did not seem entirely prepared to handle the

onslaught of resistance to SRHR at the turn of the millennium (Crossette, 2005). Others, like Sadik, had come to feel that the UN was backpedaling fast from its prior support of SRHR, in historic documents like the Cairo Programme. Sadik explained to Crossette (2005), "Gender is supposed to be mainstreamed in everything at the UN, but when it comes to actually designing how to treat the main issues of women's empowerment and control, their reproductive decisions are totally ignored. Some of this is the fault of governments, but some is also the reluctance of some of the Secretariat," she said. "Many men, deep down, don't really want women to have control. I really start to believe that, because it's really quite strange the way people who you think have supported the idea of reproductive rights for women find justification and excuses for not doing so." (p. 76)

Influential Opponents and Allies

The third, and most comprehensive component I have examined in regard to the SRHR movement's political opportunity structures during the Bush era is in regard to influential opponents and allies. Who were the main opponents that the movement has had to deal with during the Bush era? Which allies could the movement still rely on from years past, when they had greater access to institutions? In the following section, I identify and describe the prominent opponents and allies at length and then go on to explore the frames and strategies the movement utilized in response to these actors in Chapter three.

Opponents

The SRHR movement has had to navigate amongst many opponents during the Bush era, the main one being the administration itself. It is an administration heavily influenced by conservative, Christian religious fundamentalists who adamantly oppose women's sexual and reproductive rights and seek to impose that opposition on as many women as possible. The administration has been very successful in limiting SRHR both in the US and abroad through a variety of measures. Very closely aligned with the Bush administration is the "Right to Life" or "pro-life" movement, re-energized after electing another "pro-life" politician to the White House in 2000. The SRHR movement has had to fight the "Right to Life" movement (RLM) not just on the domestic level, but also on the international level, after the RLM has become more savvy about advancing their objectives and activities on the international stage and in developing countries. The administration, of course, has fully supported the RLM's expansion to international politics both ideologically and financially through their "faith-based initiatives".

Bush administration

The George W. Bush administration has been the single largest opponent to the SRHR movement in regard to international family planning from 2001 to present. Although Bush has spoken in terms of finding common ground for agreement with 'others' in regard to SRHR since his first presidential campaign speeches through present times (On the Issues, 2007), the movement has not seen any room for common ground or agreement based upon the many actions he has taken in direct opposition to their support for international family planning funding. I describe the following main actions Bush has taken in opposition to international family planning funding here: USAID funding cuts; the Global Gag Rule; UNFPA funding cuts; and contraceptive supply cuts.

USAID Funding Cuts

The main US agency for international family planning funding is the US Agency for International Development, or USAID. USAID's international family planning assistance program will spend \$432 million in 2007, which represents about 5% of USAID's foreign assistance budget and 0.02% of the US's total development assistance budget (USAID, 2007). NGO Population Action International reports, "When adjusted for inflation, current (FY 2007) US funding for family planning/reproductive health programs is 41% less than the FY 1995 level. At the same time these steep funding reductions have taken place, the number of women of reproductive age (15-49) in the developing world alone has increased by approximately 275 million women." The US is still the largest international development donor in terms of actual dollars, but it is the least generous among donor governments relative to gross national income (PAI, 2007c).

Since the 2001 terrorist attacks in New York, the Bush administration has increasingly tied development assistance to its National Security Strategy for combating global terrorism and has involved previously domestic-level, more political, departments in international matters. These changes have allowed the administration to utilize neo-liberal approaches to development and international affairs by sidestepping the traditionally less political agency of USAID, emphasizing free markets, and rewarding countries "committed to democracy" (Ethelston, et al, 2004, p. 130). After decades of the US being an international leader in population assistance and believing that it was a crucial factor in promoting economic and social progress in developing countries, USAID is now forced to justify its SRHR funding in narrow, market-based terms of "improving health" (Ethelston, et al, 2004, p. 131).

The US has donated a sizeable amount of family planning money in the past to the UNFPA, the UN Fund for Population Assistance. However, those funds have been eliminated under the Bush administration. (See upcoming section on UNFPA funding cuts).

The SRHR movement has been justifiably dismayed over Bush's cuts to the USAID population assistance (PA) budget. USAID PA funds hit an all-time high under the Clinton administration in FY95 at \$541.6 million (PAI, 2007c). The seating of a Republican-controlled Congress in 1995 changed the budget dramatically so that it dropped during Clinton's tenure to a low of \$372.5 million (PAI, 2007c). The Bush administration's funding of USAID PA programs has ranged from a low of \$429.5 million to a high of \$446.5 million (PAI, 2007c). Opponents to international family planning assistance point to the fact that the Bush administration has kept PA funding levels at about three-quarters of the record high set by the Clinton administration. However, family planning proponents counter that much of the funding is committed to supporting abstinence-only and faith-based programs that discourage contraception. Ed Szymkowiak of the American Life League, an anti-choice political group, says, "I would say we've got to cut that USAID (referring to the agency's population funds). I mean, we'd like to eliminate it totally" (Mercier, 2003, March 9). According to USAID, studies in several countries have shown that for every \$1 invested in family planning programs, governments save as much as \$16 in reduced expenditures in health, education, and social services (US Senate, 2001). Since taking office in 2001, George W. Bush has applied the Global Gag Rule (GGR) restrictions to not only USAID funding, but also to PA funds distributed through the State Department, and, to some extent, the UN Fund for Population Assistance (UNFPA) because he has eliminated the US contribution completely (see following sections).

Global Gag Rule

The Global Gag Rule (GGR) does not seem to have had a consistently negative effect on abortion legalization internationally, either in its first term of 1984-1992 or in its current term of 2000 to present. Despite the Global Gag Rule, twenty-nine countries have liberalized their abortion laws since it was first enacted in 1984. Although international family planning opponents may try to argue that the Gag Rule is consistent with the laws and values of the countries where USAID operates, in reality more than two-thirds of those countries permit legal abortion for reasons other than to save the life of the woman, rape, or incest (PAI, 2004, p. 2). Since the GGR's first enactment in 1984, five countries have tightened their laws against abortion and only 25% of the world's population live in countries where abortion is illegal (IPPF,

n.d.). However, because of the Gag Rule, NGOs in countries where abortion is illegal who receive any US funding are strictly prohibited from lobbying to liberalize abortion laws, even if it is not with US funds. On the other hand, anti-choice NGOs who receive US funds and operate within countries where abortion is legal are perfectly entitled to lobby to limit or criminalize abortion (IPPF, n.d.).

The Global Gag Rule and laws making abortion illegal do not stop women from having abortions. It is estimated that in 2006, 19 million women had unsafe abortions (defined as an induced abortion conducted either by persons lacking the necessary skills or in an environment lacking the minimal medical and hygienic standards, or both), with approximately 70,000 of those women dying from their unsafe abortion (IPPF, n.d.). The International Planned Parenthood Federation notes, "In Latin America abortion is illegal or severely restricted in virtually every country, yet the abortion rate is one of the highest in the world, far exceeding that of Western Europe or North America." Senator Barbara Boxer, (D-CA), noted in a 2001 Senate hearing on the Global Gag Rule, "The recent increased availability of modern family planning methods has already resulted in a 33% drop in the abortion rate in Russia and a 60% reduction in Hungary (US Senate, 2001)." The Bush administration seems to ignore the fact that in developing nations, family planning services, which decrease the abortion rate, are usually co-located with other health services, including abortion where it is legal. Therefore, if a clinic that refers for, provides, or lobbies for safe, legal abortion also provides other health services, they will have to refuse all US funding.

Both American and international observers point to the hypocrisy of the US imposing a policy like the GGR. Bishop (2004) notes, "The policy restricts the freedom of speech in other countries—an action that would be unconstitutional if implemented in this country" (p. 5). Cyprian Awiti, a Kenyan program director for the reproductive health organization Marie Stopes International says, "I think the Americans are running away from their responsibility. I mean, how do Americans talk about equality of women, and run away from reproductive health?" (Mercier, 2003, March 9). US Senator Harry Reid, D-NV, said at a 2001 Senate hearing, "(the GGR) restricts foreign organizations in a way that would be unconstitutional in our own country. Exporting a policy that's unconstitutional at home is, in my opinion, the ultimate act of hypocrisy (US Senate, 2001)." Many non-profits and NGOs have sued various agencies of the US Government for the constitutional free speech violations of the Global Gag Rule, but each time the US courts have not found in their favor⁶ (Page, 2006, PAI, 2004, 2006, n.d.).

⁶ When NGOs including Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Population Action International, the Pathfinder Fund, Population Council, the Association for Voluntary Surgical Contraception, and

The Bush administration and its allies, while adamantly defending the limitations of the Global Gag Rule, downplay its effects on family planning providers in developing nations. Former senator Tim Hutchinson (R-AR), maintained in a 2001 Senate hearing that only nine NGOs out of 547 refused US funding for FY2000 due to the Global Gag Rule's restrictions. At the same hearing, Senator Olympia Snowe (R-ME), testified that, "According to the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, the (Global Gag Rule) will penalize 59 countries whose (NGOs) receive family planning assistance funds from the US (US Senate, 2001)." Even if only a 'few' NGOs refuse funding, some of the NGOs provide the great majority of all services. The largest international provider of family planning services, the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), could not abide by the GGR's restrictions and had to forgo all \$17 million of US funding in 2001. IPPF has 149 member associations in 182 countries, so the impacts were indeed major for women (IPPF, n.d.). Due to this disparity in reporting on the effects of the GGR, NGOs within the SRHR movement are now conducting their own impact studies to document the consequences of the debilitating policy. These studies will be discussed in an upcoming chapter on the movement's activities in response to the Bush administration's policies.

The effect in the field of the Global Gag Rule on HIV/AIDS programs has been tremendous, considering that most HIV/AIDS service are hosted jointly with family planning programs, many of whom have had to refuse US funds because of the Gag Rule. Reproductive health proponents say that "in most parts of the world, family planning services and HIV/AIDS programs are integrated, (so) separating them would be extremely difficult for both logistical and financial reasons" (Mercier, 2003, March 10). If the one clinic in the area that provides family planning services as well as HIV/AIDS services closes down or significantly reduces their services because of reduced funding, there may be no other clinic to take their place. Valerie DeFillipo, services director for Planned Parenthood's Global Partners Program, asks, "If (U.N. Secretary General) Kofi Annan says the face of AIDS in Africa is a woman, why have family planning in one place and another for AIDS treatment?" (Mercier, 2003, March 10).

Yet another issue that NGO workers and SRHR advocates consistently bring up in relation to the Global Gag Rule is the (perceived) concept of 'fungibility'. The Bush administration maintains that the need for the GGR lies in the idea that aid

the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy sued the U.S. government regarding the GGR, US courts maintained that the policy did not violate the constitutional first amendment rights to free speech, or NGOs' ability to support abortion services because the decision to accept US funding is based on "independent choice" (PAI, n.d.)

money is fungible so that if the US gives funding to NGOs who provided abortions, even if it was not to go toward funding abortions, the NGO would then just use other money to provide abortion services, and the US would actually be 'funding' abortions. However, those in the SRHR movement argue that if there is to be a matter of 'fungibility' applied to these funding matters, then "faith-based organizations" that are being supported by the administration, with no concerns of conflict of interest or tax violations, should be restricted. The administration has maintained, when questioned about the co-mingling of taxpayer funds with funds from churches for "faith-based organizations", that the "faith-based organizations" are somehow able to keep the funds separate in a way that abortion providers would not. "Faith-based organizations" have become increasingly active in the international SRHR arena during the Bush era, most often promoting Bush's abstinence-only agenda with a no-condoms approach, even in areas the most devastated by HIV/AIDS. Population Action International (2004) reports, "Indeed, it is important to note that current law does not require groups receiving HIV/AIDS funds to 'endorse, utilize, or participate in a prevention method or treatment program to which the organization has a religious or moral objection' (p. 132)." Meanwhile, SRHR advocates are not entitled to raise religious or moral objections to the Global Gag Rule and its restrictions.

Although the Global Gag Rule may not get much attention from the American public, the international community is very vocal in its opposition. The policy is regularly addressed at international meetings and when discussing international family planning assistance in the international press. In July 2003, The Reproductive Rights Alliance (RRA), a South African abortion-rights NGO, held a demonstration protesting Bush's trip to South Africa. The group said that Bush's support of the Global Gag Rule amounted to "genocide" and a "war on women's bodies" in Africa. RRA also claimed that the Policy is responsible for 1.5 million unwanted births, 15,000 maternal deaths, 92,000 infant deaths and 2.2 million unsafe abortions (Kaiser Family Foundation, 2003). The Global Gag Rule restrictions were put into effect for another source of US international aid in August, 2003, when President Bush applied the restriction to all State Department funds. The State Department budget, which was over \$8 billion at the time, is now subject to the policy that before had only applied to grant monies from the USAID family planning program (NARAL, 2007a).

UNFPA Funding Cuts

In July 2002, George W. Bush launched another assault on funding for international family planning services when he zeroed out the US's entire \$34 million budget for the U.N. Fund for Population Assistance (UNFPA) by executive action.

NARAL notes, "He subsequently canceled funding for the FY04, FY05, and FY'06 cycles as well. UNFPA provides reproductive health care, including family planning services, but not abortion, to the world's poorest women, and specializes in caring for refugees and addressing other crises" (NARAL, UNFPA). Bush's cancellation of the UNFPA funds came after an extreme anti-choice organization, the Population Research Institute (PRI), made unsubstantiated claims that UNFPA funding was linked to forced abortions in China.

Bush has justified the UNFPA cuts by saying that the UNFPA was violating the 1985 Kemp-Kasten Amendment, which stipulates that no funds can be allocated to any organization or program "which supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or sterilization" (Benen, 2004, Hinrichsen, 2004, & Kort, 2003). Anti-choice lawmakers and organizations were instrumental in convincing the administration that UNFPA funds were being used in this manner, even when there wasn't sufficient evidence to support their claims. A fact-finding team from the administration's own State Department found on their mission to China in May 2003 that there was no evidence linking UNFPA to coercive practices in China. News agency Knight Ridder and *The Washington Post* obtained the unpublished State Department report that found that the UNFPA program in China actually "improved women's lives by helping them prevent unwanted pregnancies through education and family planning services, thus reducing the number of abortions under China's repressive population policy" (Benen, 2004 & Mercier, 2003, March 10). Even though the Bush administration has strong ties with the Chinese government in a myriad of business endeavors and provides funding for such health issues as HIV and SARS, their religious fundamentalist aims in regard to international family planning funding came into play again when the administration decided to cut all UNFPA funding (NARAL, 2007).

A UN delegation to China found that the UNFPA programming in China was "...entirely based on a voluntary approach to family planning." A British inquiry also found no link between the UNFPA and abuses in China (Benen, 2004, Hinrichsen, 2004, & Mercier, 2003, March 10). Those in the SRHR movement point once again to the Religious Right and its strong relationship with Bush in the UNFPA funding battle. Representative Carol Maloney (D-NY) notes, "PRI is the only organization that has ever made these allegations. The administration is going against the will of Congress and the international community by allowing a small band of extremists to hamstring its foreign policy" (Hinrichsen, 2004). Ronald Green, Chairman of the Department of Religion at Dartmouth and a member of the 2003 fact-finding trip to China, says, "The Bush Administration has made UNFPA a sacrificial lamb for the Religious Right in America. It's crass election politics. These groups not only

oppose abortion, they are against family planning and reproductive health in general. Their positions...have no basis in reality" (Hinrichsen, 2004).

Benen (2004) notes that when Bush initially cut the funding in 2002, "Over 120 members of Congress cosigned a letter... arguing that they considered the (Congressional funding allocation for) UNFPA to be binding." But, Bush said he disagreed and refused to release the funds while also declaring that he would veto any bill that Congress passed to restore the funding (Benen, p. 126). Additionally, Bush went against this Congressional intent for funding international family planning when he diverted \$25 million of the FY03 and \$12.5 million of the FY04 funds that Congress had appropriated for UNFPA to programs to combat sex trafficking (PAI, 2007c). The funding for UNFPA, traditionally provided through the Foreign Operations spending bill, is moot until Congress lifts the administration's funding restriction. Pro-choice lawmakers, including Democrats and Republicans, attempted to lift the restriction during debate of the FY03, FY04, and FY'05, and FY'06 spending bills, but were ultimately unsuccessful (Kort, 2004 and NARAL)." Congress has even tried to float bills for UNFPA funding that would withhold "country-specific" funds if China failed to certify that it met the conditions set in the Kemp-Kasten amendment. However, the administration has failed to agree to even that pragmatic of an agreement (Kort, p. 120).

Total UNFPA funding withheld to date by Bush is \$127 million (UNFPA). NARAL and the UNFPA report that each year, the cancelled funds could prevent: 2 million unintended pregnancies; nearly 800,000 abortions; and more than 81,000 deaths (Benen, 2004, Hinrichsen, 2004, Kort, 2004, and NARAL). The elimination of UNFPA funding is especially debilitating because of the fact that the UNFPA has a presence in dozens of countries where USAID population funds are unavailable. UNFPA notes, "With 171 donor countries, UNFPA enjoys the broadest base of support of any UN agency. This includes commitments from every country in sub-Saharan Africa and each region of the world" (UNFPA).

Contraceptive Supply Cuts

Under the Clinton administration, the USAID, along with the UNFPA, was one of the two largest donors in the world of condoms to poor, developing countries to aid in the prevention of HIV/AIDS, as well as to provide protection against STDs and unwanted pregnancies. USAID was responsible at the time for procuring and delivering more than one-third of all contraceptive supplies to developing nations (GGR.org). After seven years of a Republican-dominated Congress, a shift toward Christian religious fundamentalism, and the introduction of the Bush era, in 2002 USAID provided less contraceptive supplies than they had in 1990, even before

inflation is taken into account (Ethelston, et al, 2004, P. 134). Bush ended shipments of "condoms and other contraceptive supplies to 16 of the poorest developing nations in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific." These recipients were the only NGOs receiving USAID-donated contraceptives in their respective countries (GGR.org). Total donation of supplies has remained about the same since 2001, even though their costs have risen dramatically and the demand has risen even faster (Cohen, 2006). Because of the Global Gag Rule and their refusal to abide by its conditions, family planning agencies in another 13 countries, nearly all in sub-Saharan Africa, no longer get condoms and contraceptives from USAID (Hinrichsen, 2004). If a foreign family planning NGO refuses to comply with the GGR, in addition to losing funding dollars, they also lose all US-donated contraceptives, including condoms for HIV/AIDS (PAI, 2004, p. 1).

The "Right to Life" Movement

In addition to the administration itself, another powerful opponent during the Bush era has been the "Right to Life" movement. The "Right to Life" or "Pro-Life" movement is a highly organized coalition of individuals, churches, and organizations that work together to limit and/or eliminate women's SRHR, especially abortion. The movement enjoyed a peak in activity in the 1980's and early 1990's, when they were able to push the boundaries of US laws to limit healthcare access, threaten patients and doctors, and even bomb and kill at abortion clinics. In the 1990's, the "Right to Life" movement was especially aroused when the SRHR movement was able to elect a pro-choice President for the first time in 12 years. A US-based conservative, Christian organization called Human Life International founded and financed the influential Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (C-FAM) and the Population Research Institute (PRI) in the 1990's while Clinton was in office.

Now, in the Bush era, these groups have become Washington 'insiders' and regulars at the UN. Richard Snyder of UNFPA pointed out in 2004 that, "These groups have been around for the past decade. The difference is that now they have an ear in the White House (Hinrichsen, 2004)." The PRI had such a ready and waiting ear in George W. Bush that they were the ones to take their unsubstantiated claims of UNFPA funding going toward forced abortions in China all the way to the point of the President cancelling all UNFPA funding, despite the repeated field reports that PRI's information was unequivocally false. Other groups that are part of a coalition with C-FAM and the PRI include the Pro-Life Action League, the American Life League, Campaign Life Coalition, Concerned Women for America, and National Right to Life Committee. Several researchers are now reporting on a conservative counter-network at the UN, with Buss and Herman (2003) dubbing this coalition the

Christian Right United Nations (CR UN). In addition to those mentioned above as partnering with C-FAM, the CR UN is said to include such organizations as Focus on the Family, the Family Research Council, REAL Women, and the World Movement of Mothers (Chappell, p. 494).

C-FAM is reported to disrupt UN meetings and actively orchestrate misinformation campaigns against the UN from their offices nearby in New York City. This includes characterizing UNFPA and NGOs engaged in reproductive health and family planning initiatives in developing countries as “anti-family”. Stirling Scruggs of UNFPA says that these groups “...(are) not just anti-abortion, they are anti-women, and oppose population policies and programs in general. They hate us because we have been very effective in promoting women’s rights and providing poor communities with the information and means to voluntarily plan their families (Hinrichsen, 2004, pp. 1-2).” Although groups like C-FAM and the CR UN are not official governmental delegates to the UN, they are almost always able to enlist the support and leadership they need from Bush administration officials and other governments that join in on their ‘unholy alliance’ (Chappell, p. 503).

Allies

Allies to the SRHR movement during the Bush era have been few and far between. The UN and UNFPA have not been, or have not been able to be, as powerful a resource to the movement as they had been in the past. The ongoing work of the key NGOs in the movement has had the greatest impact on SRHR (see next chapter). Private foundations have continued to support international family planning funding, although they are doing so at lower levels, partly due to the demands of the HIV/AIDS crisis, partly due to ‘donor fatigue’ around the issue, and partly due to pressures from the neo-liberal, religious fundamentalist environments the US and other major donor countries are perpetuating. However, several other donor countries have stepped up to meet the challenge of the loss of funding from the US and private foundations. The US has seen continued efforts by the Congress to support the SRHR movement, but a Republican party majority (until 2007) with a “pro-life” platform has overshadowed most efforts.

Private Foundations

Although it can be said that total funding for family planning from private foundations has been negatively impacted during the Bush administration, private foundations have done a great deal to increase their support for SRHR in the developing world over the past two decades. Major private foundations that currently

support international SRHR include: The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; The Ford Foundation; The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; The David and Lucille Packard Foundation; the Rockefeller Foundation; the United Nations Foundation; and the Wellcome Trust. UNFPA actually saw a five-fold increase in their contributions from private foundations from 1996 to 2002 (Ethelston, et al, 2004, P. 143).

Funding trends for private foundations for SRHR, especially family planning, have not progressed in an entirely positive upward trend. As of 2002, as much as one-half of all population assistance funds from private foundations were earmarked for HIV/AIDS activities. Formerly one of the largest donors for family planning, the Mellon Foundation discontinued their funding in 2005. In the past, they had funded universities and NGOs including the Alan Guttmacher Institute and the Population Council for research, policy analysis, and training activities (Ethelston, et al, 2004, P. 145).

Other Donor Countries

Many donor countries have stepped up to the challenge to increase their family planning funding after the reductions made by the Bush administration. Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Spain, and the United Kingdom had committed by 2004 to increase their assistance relative to their gross national income by 2015. Some nations, including Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK, as well as the European Commission, have been especially critical of the increasingly conservative stance of the Bush administration in regard to family planning funding and have increased their SRHR policy and funding commitments. Several of these donor countries have characterized the loss of funding to NGOs from the US due to the and for UNFPA as a “decency gap” (Ethelston, et al, 2004, p. 11). The European Commission specifically increased its grants for International Planned Parenthood Federation projects in Rwanda and the Dominican Republic to address this funding gap (EC, 2004).

Pro-Choice Congresspersons

Although the US Congress had been dominated by the Republican party from 1994-2004, the Senate has actually held a pro-choice majority, with both Democratic and Republican Senators supporting SRHR (NARAL). The largest amount of Congressional support to the SRHR movement in relation to international family planning funding has been around the issues of the Global Gag Rule and the elimination of UNFPA funding by the US (as discussed previously). Since Bush re-

enacted the GGR on his first day in office, pro-choice congresspersons have tried every year to pass legislation that would nullify his Executive Order. They have most often attached their efforts to foreign policy funding bills, but have always come up short for the number of votes needed to override a presidential veto. Republican representative James Greenwood (PA) has strongly criticized the GGR and even went to Kenya in 2002 to see its effects in person. Greenwood told a reporter at the time, "Unfortunately, our party has been co-opted by so-called religious or neo-conservatives. They have persuaded themselves that if they cut funding to agencies that provide or counsel on abortions, somehow that will actually reduce abortions" (Kort, 2004).

In the 2006 Congress, a bi-partisan group consisting of both pro-choice and anti-choice Congresspersons proposed legislation that would free up much-needed contraceptive supplies to developing nations. The "Ensuring Access to Contraceptives Act of 2006" would have doubled the amount that USAID spent on contraceptives to \$150 million each year in FY 2007 and FY 2008. The legislation would also have enabled NGOs restricted by the Global Gag Rule to again receive US-donated contraceptive supplies (Cohen, 2006). However, under threat of presidential veto and a still Republican-dominated Congress, the measure failed to gain passage.

Conclusion

This chapter explored at length the Political Opportunity Structures in place during the Bush era. The election of a religious fundamentalist, neo-liberal conservative in George W. Bush and the concurrent international trends toward an era of increased globalization and growing neo-liberalism were significant factors in the era's political alignments and conflicts. Access to institutions for the SRHR movement greatly diminished during this time, both in Washington and at the UN. Influential opponents far outnumbered allies, with the "Right to Life" movement being greatly enabled by the Bush administration, the largest opponent to SRHR. The SRHR movement was able to keep and even expand many of its Allies, namely domestic pro-choice congresspersons, private donor foundations, and other donor countries. The following chapter will explore the mobilizing, or movement action structures, the SRHR movement utilized to frame their issues and advance their cause during the Bush era. This will include an in-depth description of the key actors in the SRHR movement during this time, as well as the strategies and actions they have employed to strive for their goals.

CHAPTER 3

MOVEMENT ACTION STRATEGIES

In this chapter, I examine the mobilizing, or Movement Action Strategies, that the SRHR movement has utilized in response to the predominantly negative Political Opportunity Structures of the Bush era. The strategies the movement has utilized to present, 'sell', or 'spin' their issues are called "frames" and, in this case, consist of three main categories that I will identify and describe. I will go on to an analysis of the different action strategies the movement utilized beyond their framing of the issues. This includes an in-depth description of the work of key NGOs in the SRHR movement during this time, with phone interview data from organizational spokespersons. The main action strategies the movement utilized fall into four main categories: fighting for their cause in the US Courts and Congress; working within the UN system; obtaining new funders; and producing research impact reports.

Framing

Another major theoretical component of social movement or political process theory lies in the "framing" of a movement's issues. Benford and Snow (2000) define frames as "action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization" (p. 614). In the case of this study, I am examining a social movement and the organizations within that movement. The Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights movement has sought to frame its issues in a number of ways over time, in an ever-evolving response to the domestic and international political climate. While the more SRHR-friendly Clinton administration of the 1990's allowed for framing the movement's issues under the terminology of "women's rights" or "reproductive rights", the negative political opportunity structures of the Bush era have necessitated more conservatively-minded approaches to framing SRHR. In order to try to make any headway in the hostile environment of the new millennium, the movement has had to carefully craft frames that will speak to a broader audience and connect the issues of SRHR with women's health, social and economic development, and prevention of unintended pregnancy and abortion.

“Safe Motherhood” or “Maternal Mortality”

One of the most oft-used frames by the SRHR movement during the Bush era has involved the prevention of women's deaths from unsafe abortions, lack of prenatal care, and unsafe deliveries. “Safe Motherhood” or “Maternal Mortality” are the terms used for these frames that are most frequently presented by the SRHR movement today. The UNFPA (2007) states that 251,340 women have died as of June 2007 from a lack of family planning, skilled birth attendance, or emergency obstetric care. UNFPA (2007) calls attention to the fact that an estimated 74,000 women die from unsafe abortions every year and that every minute one woman dies in childbirth. Due to the fact that almost no one, public or private citizen, can argue against the need for reducing maternal mortality or ensuring safe motherhood, this frame has been the most widely accepted during the Bush era and the most easily incorporated into funding, programming, and policy making. Even with the high level of disappointment by those in the SRHR community around the lack of SRHR in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), one entire goal out of eight is focused solely on the issue of reducing maternal mortality (World Bank, 2004).

SRHR promoting Social and Economic Development

Several actors in the SRHR movement currently frame SRHR in terms of advancing social and economic development. This has been a frame used by the movement in some form or another since the beginning of UNFPA and population assistance programs in the 1960's. In its current form, this frame emphasizes human rights (implicitly including women's rights) and individual autonomy in controlling ones' reproduction as being paramount to the advancement of social and economic development. Population Action International is one of the NGOs that situates SRHR in the broader frame of social and economic development. They believe that, “the single biggest factor affecting the world's natural resources is human population growth” (PAI, 2007). A sub-frame of economic development includes the environmental movement and its aims to curb population growth and the subsequent depletion of natural resources. However, feminist actors in the SRHR movement are careful to assert that it is an individual's right of reproductive choice that should be the deciding factor in the control of population growth, rather than ‘targets’ or governmental incentives or mandates. This frame can be more contentious than the “safe motherhood” frame to those in the “Right to Life” movement because they disagree with the right of women to control their reproduction, especially through contraception and/or abortion.

“A Prevention Challenge”

The most current, and perhaps most controversial frame advanced by the SRHR movement has been in the terms of a “prevention challenge”. Several NGOs have worked to focus the Bush administration and the donor community on the prevention end of international family planning issues, both as a way to ‘tone down’ their volatility and to try to reduce the negative effects brought on by a lack of prevention efforts. Population Action International is one of the NGOs, along with NARAL Pro-Choice America, that have sought to consistently frame the issues around international family planning funding in terms of ‘prevention’. Both organizations have worked alongside other SRHR NGOs on the domestic level to pursue a ‘Prevention First’ initiative in Congress which emphasizes prevention education, information, and supplies to combat the issues of unplanned pregnancies, teenage pregnancies, and abortion. On the international level, they hope that ‘prevention first’ can lead to increased donations of contraceptive supplies and an end to abstinence-only sexuality/HIV/AIDS education (Lasher, 2007). A sub-frame of the prevention frame is found in the terms “evidence-based” or “medically accurate”. This frame is being advanced in response to the abstinence-only funding and programming promoted by the Bush administration. SRHR researchers, including those from the executive branch, have had six years to study the results of international (and domestic) abstinence-only education and have found that it is not effective in preventing pregnancies, STDs/HIV/AIDS, or abortions and may even lead to an increase in these outcomes because of its lack of information for sexually active individuals (Pathfinder, 2007).

Action Strategies

The SRHR movement has utilized a number of tactics and strategies to advance international family planning funding issues during the Bush administration. I start this section talking about UN documents and conferences in general that the movement has worked on during this era. I then go on to examine new funders the movement has turned to in response to the lack of funding from the US as well as impact reports the movement has generated to demonstrate the effects of a lack of international family planning funding. Lastly, I profile the work of three different central actor NGOs during this time; Ipas; Pathfinder International; and Population Action International. I conducted phone interviews in August 2007 with spokespeople from these organizations, focusing on their response to the negative opportunity structures presented by the Bush administration and the international community during the Bush era.

Work at the UN

After the successes of NGOs at the UN population and women's conferences of the 1990's, SRHR NGOs were caught off guard by their exclusion in the MDG drafting process. Crossette (2005) reports the following: (The UN General Assembly President and Secretariat)...

...did not want to deal with the controversies of and backlash to the Cairo programme. They wanted a streamlined report-writing process with little controversy or stalling. Most governmental delegates were not included in the drafting, and there was no preparatory committee, as there often is when drafting UN documents. NGOs and even government experts were barred entirely from the process of drafting the declaration. (Many nations at the UN) had become alarmed at the exponential growth and influence of civil society organizations (NGOs) and were trying to limit their participation and action.

Crossette (2005) notes that the SRHR movement had a significant friend in the World Bank at the time of the MDG drafting, because the Bank "argued vigorously for an unambiguous and explicit statement—indeed a separate goal—on sexual and reproductive rights, but it was unable to budge the UN" (p. 72).

Jacqueline Sharpe, president of the Family Planning Association of Trinidad, says that important lessons were learned about why the MDGs emerged as they did, shorn of reproductive rights. "We did not really pay the kind of attention we should have," she said of NGOs that were excluded from the discussion (Crossette, 2005, p.74). After the tough lessons learned from the MDG process, several NGO leaders have increased their push for more official standing of NGOs by the UN so that they have a seat at the table. Sharpe (Crossette, 2005) contends, "We need to get on official delegations given that the exclusion of NGOs from the discussion is likely to continue" (p. 74).

The SRHR movement has worked hard to see that SRHR were more thoroughly covered in the MDGs by pushing for their revision since their implementation in 2001. The movement was successful in its efforts when at the 2005 UN World Summit they were able to gain an agreement to revise the MDGs to include universal access to reproductive health care, a measure in line with the Cairo programme adopted 11 years earlier (PlanetWire, 2005). This was indeed a huge victory for the SRHR movement, as UNFPA Director Thoraya Ahmed Obaid stated after the conference, "This outcome is a success for millions of women, men and young people all over the world whose appeals have been heard. We must now focus our energy on fulfilling the commitments made by world leaders" (PlanetWire, 2005). The draft measure from the September, 2005 World Summit was finally solidified in

October, 2006 when the UN General Assembly agreed to adopt the new target (UN-INSTRAW, 2006). Dr. Gill Greer, Director General of IPPF said at the time, “Despite continued opposition from some governments, including the United States, the UN General Assembly has made a decision that will save the lives and reduce the suffering of millions of women worldwide...” (UN-INSTRAW, 2006).

New Funders

During the Bush era, the SRHR movement has had to work with increasingly diminished funding from the US government for international family planning. US funding for family planning/reproductive health programs is 41% less than the FY 1995 level when adjusted for inflation. The US is still the largest international development donor in terms of actual dollars, but it is the least generous among donor governments relative to gross national income (PAI, 2007c). The SRHR movement has worked hard to solicit new donors and funding streams since they can no longer count on US funding to provide the largest segment of international family planning funding as they had from the 1960's to mid-1990's. The movement has found these new funding allies in foreign donor governments, private donors, and private foundations.

34 Million Friends of UNFPA

In response to George W. Bush's elimination of all of the (\$34 million) UNFPA funding contribution, two American women began a grass-roots campaign in 2002 to mobilize the public to give \$1 or more each to make up for the funding loss. They call their initiative the *34 Million Friends of UNFPA* campaign and conduct it via email, a link through the UNFPA website, speaking engagements, and rallies. They have raised over \$3.5 million so far from over 100,000 individuals and donors (UNFPA, n.d.). Funds are applied to UNFPA's main priority area, which is to help ensure universal access to quality reproductive health information and care to all couples and individuals by the year 2015. UNFPA does not provide funding for abortions, but rather other reproductive health care services which may include post-abortion care.

Safe Abortion Action Fund/UK government

After asking the IPPF to provide a study of the effects of unsafe abortion worldwide (see upcoming section on Impact Reports), the UK government decided to create a fund to address the funding gap created by policies such as the Global Gag

Rule and diminished international support for family planning (Boseley, 2006, February 6). In early 2006, the UK government initiated the \$5.6 million "Safe Abortion Action Fund" (SAAF). The governments of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland subsequently agreed to add to the fund, bringing the total to \$14.87 million. The SAAF is intended to offset the reduction in reproductive health care funding by the US, especially due to the limits of the GGR. There is no official sum for the amount of funding lost due to the GGR, but some of the figure can be illustrated by looking at the largest reproductive health care provider in the world, the IPPF. IPPF alone is reported to lose \$18 million in US funding each year from not agreeing to work within the confines of the GGR. And, an additional estimated \$43 million a year in US funding is not being distributed to family planning agencies because President Bush has cut all UNFPA funding. Although those involved are hoping that the SAAF might total up to \$35 million, that figure would clearly not meet the gap left by the lack of US funding.

The SAAF, which can be used toward advocacy, operations research, or service delivery, is being administered by IPPF as appointed by the UK government. Interestingly, the Fund *can* be used for safe abortion services, which are not funded by either the US (even without the GGR) or UNFPA. The GGR eliminated funding to a great number of family planning agencies that were not only unable to provide abortions with their own, separate funding, but were unable to provide family planning services, which would eliminate the need for abortion. An October 2006 submission deadline for the SAAF brought 172 proposals requesting over \$41 million in funding from NGOs wanting to provide services under the program. In May of 2007, forty-five projects at NGOs in thirty-two different countries were awarded \$11.1 million in funding for a two-year cycle (IPPF, 2007).

IPPF and the UK government's hope is that not only will the SAAF meet the goals of IPPF and other SRHR NGOs, but that it will show the UK and other donor governments' commitments to meeting the Millennium Development Goal regarding maximizing maternal health and reducing maternal morbidity (due to unsafe abortion in this case, which results in an estimated 70,000 deaths per year from an estimated total of 19 million unsafe abortions) (IPPF, 2006a, p. 3). UK International Development Minister Gareth Thomas stated in regard to the need for the Fund, "We work very closely with the Americans but we have a very different view from them on abortion. We know from experience that the absence of sexual and reproductive health services results in an increase in unintended pregnancies and, inevitably, a greater number of unsafe abortions" (Guttmacher, 2006).

Impact Reports

The SRHR movement has attempted to be more savvy in their response to the negative political opportunity structures of the Bush era by employing researchers to document the effects of funding reductions and restrictions from such measures as the Global Gag Rule. Only two empirical studies had examined the impact of the Global Gag Rule, but both looked only at the Reagan-George H.W. Bush era. Researchers that examined the studies found that the studies could not “fully assess the policy’s broad consequences for access to contraceptive or abortion services, much less for women’s health” (Cincotta and Crane, 2001). Researchers and the media have also said that the studies failed to look at the extent to which the policy “did or did not reduce the incidence of induced abortions” (Mercier, 2003, March 10). As far as the burden placed on women in regard to the loss of contraceptive supplies, Page (2006) reports that a 2002 Johns Hopkins School of Public Health study estimates that “each \$1 million decline in contraceptive assistance results in 360,000 additional unintended pregnancies, 150,000 more induced abortions, 11,000 more infant deaths, and 800 more maternal deaths” (p. 138-9).

In a Planned Parenthood Federation of America Report on the Global Gag Rule in 2003, the organization stated,

It has never been easy to fully quantify the impact of the Gag Rule. Its ramifications are insidious and have occurred over many years. It is impossible to track how many deaths have been associated with services that could have been provided in the absence of a Gag Rule, how many advocates were silenced from speaking out about a devastating public health issue, or how many organizations were prohibited from working with their governments and other Non-Governmental Organizations to meet the serious health care needs of their own communities (IPPF, 2006a, p. 8).

“The Global Gag Rule Impact Project”, developed in 2002, conducts research to document the effects of the Global Gag Rule. The Project is led by Population Action International, in partnership with Ipas, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and the International Planned Parenthood Federation. Their field researchers from Engender Health and Pathfinder International currently conduct studies in nine countries and have produced reports on the impacts in each of these countries, including Ethiopia, Ghana, Tanzania, Kenya, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Romania, and Nepal. They distribute their reports via their website and in writing, as well as a video entitled, “*Access Denied: US Family Planning Restrictions in Zambia*”, which has now made its way to *youtube* on the internet (Global Gag Rule

Impact Project). (See upcoming section on work of Central Actor NGOs in regard to the GGRIP).

In 2003, the Center for Reproductive Rights published a 43-page report entitled "*Breaking the Silence: The Global Gag Rule's Impact on Unsafe Abortion*" which documents the grave effects of the Global Gag Rule that women (and men) in the United States do not often see or hear about. Eunice Brookman-Amissah, a Doctor in Ethiopia, says in the report, "Contrary to its stated intentions, the Global Gag Rule results in more unwanted pregnancies, more unsafe abortions, and more deaths of women and girls. We who have seen those effects first-hand can no longer tolerate silence about the Gag Rule's tragic effects" (Center for Reproductive Rights, 2003).

Active in 182 countries, the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) is the largest reproductive health care provider in the world. Because of the GGR, they are losing at least \$18 million a year in US funding and were forced to: close 14 clinics in poor Bangladeshi neighborhoods; cut \$700,000 in funding in Nepal; cut \$3 million in HIV/AIDS funding in Cambodia; close three clinics serving 56,000 clients in Kenya; and close clinics and reduce services for over 300,000 patients in Eastern Nepal (Hinrichsen, 2004). In February, 2006, the IPPF released a twenty page report on the state of unsafe abortion worldwide entitled, "Death and Denial: Unsafe Abortion and Poverty". The report provided a thorough examination of the effects of policies such as the Global Gag Rule, as well as other funding restrictions that have contributed to the ongoing epidemic of unsafe abortion. The report found that approximately 19 million women have an unsafe abortion each year, with 70,000 of them dying from these unsafe procedures, mostly in the developing world. IPPF also reported that, in countries where abortion is illegal or severely restricted, some thirty to fifty percent of maternal deaths are from unsafe abortion (Boseley, 2006, February 6). Due to the findings of the report, (as discussed earlier in this chapter in the section on "New Funders") the IPPF was able to work with the UK government to convince them to create the "Safe Abortion Action Fund", specifically tailored to meet the funding gap created by the GGR and other funding losses.

Work of Central Actor NGOs

Foremost among the actors in the SRHR movement are the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that work on a daily basis to ensure and deliver SRHR to women around the world. The agendas and foci of these organizations frequently change depending on the macro socio-political environment of the time, as well as the domestic politics of the countries they are headquartered in. Several of the US-based SRHR NGOs have had to shift their agendas, tactics, and strategies since the Bush

administration came to power in 2001, bringing a more conservative-minded government hostile to the goals of their movement. The following section examines the agendas, tactics, strategies, actions of three prominent US-based SRHR NGOs during the Bush era. Phone interviews were conducted with organizational spokespersons from Ipas, Pathfinder International, and Population Action International in August 2007.

Ipas is a thirty-four year old NGO which works to “increase women’s ability to exercise their sexual and reproductive rights, and to reduce abortion-related deaths and injuries” (Ipas, 2007a). Ipas’ work is concentrated in training, research, advocacy, distribution of equipment and supplies for reproductive health care, and information dissemination. Ipas has Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and maintains offices on five continents, providing services to more than twenty countries. Ipas has recently created a database to “facilitate quick access to data related to providing high-quality abortion and post-abortion care service delivery” (Ipas, 2007b). The database, named IDEAS (International Data for Evaluation of Abortion Services) was created to provide a standardized abortion database for researchers, funders, governments, and the public. The site is divided into five categories: general demographic data; reproductive health and abortion statistics; health workforce data; service delivery point data; and policy and regulatory data (Ipas, 2007b).

An NGO with more than fifty years experience in facilitating SRHR throughout the world, Pathfinder International currently works in 20 countries throughout Africa, Asia, the Near East, Latin America, and Europe. Pathfinder actively works to increase US support for international family planning programs while providing services through other NGOs. In regard to family planning and reproductive health services, Pathfinder “brings services to isolated rural areas by training community members to function as volunteer health workers and by creating referral networks. (They) improve and expand existing services in both urban and rural areas by renovating clinics and training health care providers to offer a wider range of services and contraceptive choices” (Pathfinder, 2007). The organization produces several research publications reporting on their local projects and SRHR issues and has a small advocacy department that works on policy issues in the US and abroad. Issues Pathfinder works on in their advocacy division include: women’s empowerment and gender equality; HIV/AIDS prevention; adolescent reproductive health; and the environment. Pathfinder provides field researchers in conjunction with other NGOs for the Global Gag Rule Impact Project (see upcoming section).

Population Action International (PAI) is a 40-year old NGO that performs policy advocacy work to “strengthen political and financial support worldwide for population programs grounded in individual rights.” PAI tries to “serve as a bridge

between the academic and policymaking communities” by: “disseminating strategic, action-oriented research publications; participating in and sponsoring conferences, meetings and seminars; and working to educate and inform policymakers and international colleagues in related fields” (PAI, 2007). They work directly with the US Congress, the Executive Branch, the UN, other international agencies, and other NGOs to reach their goals. One of the main issues PAI has been actively engaged in since the beginning of the Bush administration has been their fight against the Global Gag Rule. They have been a leader in researching the effects of the policy and producing documents and videos to create awareness about the issue. (See upcoming section on their partnership with the ‘Global Gag Rule Impact Project’.)

Confronting the Reality of a New Administration

With the election of George W. Bush and an anti-choice administration in 2000/2001, SRHR NGOs were forced to adapt to a different response coming from the White House in regard to the movement’s issues. Several tactics and strategies the SRHR NGOs had utilized in the past stayed the same, but many had to be newly developed to respond to an administration that didn’t support their objectives. Craig Lasher, Senior Policy Analyst with Population Action International (PAI) says that his organization has basically had to “play defense” since the Bush administration took office in 2001. Lasher notes that although the commencement of the Bush administration was tough on the movement, “everything was not rosy under Clinton” in regard to Clinton compromises with the Republican Congress such as the reinstatement of UNFPA funding in exchange for a modified Global Gag Rule. Instead of making gains in the area of SRHR during the Bush era, Lasher says that PAI has been forced to react to anti-choice Executive and Legislative branch actions and frame their issues in ways that might expose the extreme approaches of those entities.

Cara Hesse, Director of Public Affairs for Pathfinder International, notes that, during the Bush era, her organization has worked on both gathering more evidence of impact of negative international family planning policies such as the GGR and joining with other SRHR NGOs to more effectively fight against restrictive policies and for ensuring SRHR. For example, during the Reagan era Global Gag Rule, Pathfinder did not have any resources or staff to gather evidence of impacts from the policy. However, during the Bush era, Pathfinder has been actively gathering this type of evidence in the field in conjunction with the Global Gag Rule Impact Project. To more effectively fight for SRHR during the Bush era, Pathfinder has joined with other SRHR NGOs to form and house the International Family Planning Coalition, which now includes 40 different organizations. Hesse reports that PAI, The Guttmacher

Institute, and the Population Connection are NGOs that Pathfinder works especially closely with in this coalition.

Barbara Crane, Executive Vice President for Ipas, feels that the SRHR movement and her organization have had to “disengage” from the US government since Bush’s election. Crane says that the Democrats in Congress have not been willing during the Bush era to “go out on a limb” on international family planning issues because the issues are “too far out” for most Americans; the public doesn’t understand the issues. In response to this problem, Ipas has been trying to concentrate more on educating the public and Congress on the issue of unsafe abortion. She notes that they have had to look elsewhere for funding and leadership, finding much of both in European governments.

Main Issues During the Bush Era

PAI and Pathfinder list fighting against the GGR and its elimination of contraceptive supply donations; UNFPA funding cuts; PEPFAR and its anti-prostitution pledge for NGOs; and abstinence-only funding and programming as the main issues they have had to focus on in regard to international family planning during this period. Ipas reports working against the Global Gag Rule and the Helms Amendment and working on the *34 Million Friends of UNFPA* campaign (see upcoming section on the funding initiative) as their main foci during the Bush era. PAI’s Lasher reports that their organization continues to work in Congress to push for a dollar for dollar reduction of UNFPA funding for China in lieu of a total elimination of UNFPA funding by the US. The Gates Foundation is currently funding an initiative through PAI that will address the contraceptive supply shortfalls SRHR providers experience under the Global Gag Rule. PAI has also been actively fighting against the Bush administration policy that mandates that one-third of the funding for PEPFAR, the US AIDS funding package, must go to abstinence-only programming.

The three NGO representatives interviewed have worked hard to ensure that the Cairo programme has been kept alive. PAI was especially active in the ICPD+10 (Cairo programme) Review process of 2004 by coordinating, planning, hosting, and facilitating other SRHR NGOs in regional and national-level UN meetings and conferences. They were instrumental, along with other NGOs, in alerting other donor countries to the fact that US governmental and anti-choice NGO representatives planned to attend as many meetings and conferences as possible to register their displeasure with the Cairo programme and try to change and reduce its goal of universal access to SRHR. Several of these other major donor countries ended up attending meetings and conferences that they had not planned to attend so that they could re-affirm their commitment to the Cairo programme and SRHR funding in light

of the US's diminished support. PAI saw their crucial role at the meetings being one in which they would fight to make the Cairo programme stronger or maintained and consistently pushed for the term "reaffirm" to be used, which denotes the strongest and highest achievable level of support for a UN document. PAI is especially proud of their accomplishment of official reaffirmation of the Cairo programme, with no removal of any of its principles by the many opposition groups, including the Bush administration (Lasher, 2007 and PAI, 2005). Ipas will be working to uphold the Cairo programme and MDG tenets around safe abortion by co-sponsoring the "Global Safe Abortion Conference" this Fall (along with Marie Stopes International, an international reproductive health provider, and Abortion Rights, a British pro-choice action group).

'Framing' the Issues

The NGO representatives interviewed have all been aware of ways in which they have purposefully "framed" their issues during the Bush era. Craig Lasher from PAI states that his organization has worked to frame the issues in terms such as "evidence-based", "scientific", or "prevention" programming. He says that the goal of such framing is to portray the opposition as extreme for opposing contraception (Lasher, 2007). Cara Hesse of Pathfinder says that her organization is trying to appeal to moderates by advancing such frames as "mak(ing) abortion more rare". Barbara Crane of Ipas says that her organization has mainly worked to advance the frames of "unsafe abortion, maternal mortality, and safe motherhood".

In examining the ways in which NGOs may have tackled the Global Gag Rule differently now than in its first phase during the Reagan era, Pathfinder's Hesse says that they have always been active in opposing the GGR, as its restrictions affect the organizations they work with and its tenets violate their mission and principles. Because Pathfinder is a US-based NGO that is a 'cooperating agency' or intermediary, for government funding, they are not subjected to the GGR. Pathfinder has fought in US Courts to ensure that their private monies can be used however they want and not be restricted by the GGR (Hesse, 2007). Barbara Crane of Ipas feels that the GGR has had a "chilling effect" on NGOs fighting for safe, legal, accessible abortion. She maintains that many NGOs have now become unwilling to talk about the specifics of abortion within SRHR because of the climate created under the Global Gag Rule and the Bush administration. Crane notes that USAID now has more involvement with NGOs than they did during the Reagan GGR period because NGOs are now the major abortion service providers and receive the bulk of USAID population assistance funds. These new funding channels in turn impact more

women because of the fact that so many receive their reproductive health care through NGOs, rather than governments, who are not subjected to the GGR.

Combatting the Global Gag Rule

In both the Reagan- and Bush-era periods of the GGR, SRHR NGOs have continually brought court cases challenging the legality of the policy, which have all resulted in losses for the plaintiffs. Both Pathfinder and PAI actively fight the GGR and its provisions in the US Courts and Congress. Congressional attempts to overturn the policy throughout both periods have always come up short as well, with the Senate acting as the lead body in initiating and supporting its repeal. Hesse says that she feels that Pathfinder has probably been the most active among cooperating agencies in challenging the GGR in the Courts and Congress. She says that a supportive Board of Directors and mission have emboldened Pathfinder to challenge their major funder on this issue: the US government. As a US-based cooperating agency, Pathfinder receives 90% of its funding from US governmental agencies (Hesse, 2007). Only about 10% of their funding is from private sources; large foundations like Gates, Hewlett, and Packard and small donors. A small amount of funding they receive is from other donor governments and UNFPA (Hesse, 2007).

Another strategy SRHR NGOs have utilized to combat the GGR has been to try to provide firsthand knowledge of the policy's impact in developing countries to US policymakers. Prior to new Congressional ethics/lobbying rules enacted in the 2006 Congress, PAI hosted numerous Congressional trips to various developing countries to US lawmakers and their staff members regarding the GGR. PAI would invite both long-time SRHR supporters as well as those with mixed voting records to try to increase their awareness of SRHR issues (Lasher, 2007). From 2001 to 2006 PAI hosted its educational trips to the following countries: Guatemala; Peru; South Africa; Morocco; Mexico; Bolivia; Madagascar; Zambia; Ghana; Ethiopia; Thailand; and Puerto Rico (PAI, 2007).

An interesting turn of events in the Global Gag Rule fight can be found in the successful lawsuit Pathfinder International pursued which allows them to still provide abortions. Because Pathfinder is a US-based NGO, the Courts found that the Global Gag Rule could not be applied to their services if they were using separate, private funding for those services. They are currently the only US-based NGO that receives US funding and still provides abortions while the Global Gag Rule is in effect, because the courts have upheld their constitutional right (as a US-based NGO) to provide services with their own, separate money. These monies are gained through private foundations, individual donors, and other donor governments such as Sweden and Denmark.

Aside from their legal challenges to the GGR, both Pathfinder and PAI have been working during this phase of the policy to gather more evidence of the impact of the policy. They are major partners along with Ipas and several other NGOs in the 'Global Gag Rule Impact Project' (GGRIP) (see upcoming section on the project). Although Pathfinder's Hesse and Ipas' Crane note that it is virtually impossible to document how many abortions *weren't* performed because of the policy, they report that the project has instead focused on impacts such as clinic closings, losses of contraceptive supplies, and the like. Hesse says staff at Pathfinder were "shocked how widely the material (from the GGRIP) was used around the world" and reports that it is especially utilized in Europe to demonstrate how US-based SRHR NGOs have mobilized against a restrictive SRHR policy. Ipas' Crane reports that the GGRIP data has been the only research of its kind to have been consistently utilized throughout the world to report on the impacts of the GGR. Crane reports that the success of the GGRIP has spawned follow-up efforts of other Bush-initiated SRHR policies to demonstrate their impacts. Hesse notes that when the GGRIP was developed in 2001, Pathfinder was concerned about the political ramifications it might produce under the Bush administration, but they have been pleasantly surprised at how well documenting the impacts has worked in influencing policymakers, private funders, and other donor governments.

Work with Funders

The NGOs interviewed for this study identified several different current sources of funding for international family planning funding. As noted in the previous chapter, private foundations have continued to be major benefactors with the Gates, the Hewlett and the Packard foundations being listed as the most instrumental during this period. The NGOs interviewed point to a number of funding sources the SRHR movement has turned to in lieu of US funding: other donor governments (especially the Europeans); measures such as the Safe Abortion Action Fund implement by the UK government; increased donations to UNFPA by other countries; and individual donors.

Work at the U.N.

The changing climate at the UN during the Bush era has been widely documented in regard to SRHR (Benen, 2004, Buss and Herman, 2003, Chappell, 2006). PAI's Lasher says their organization has gone from partnering with the US delegations to the UN to a "180 degree change" whereby the US delegation consists of anti-choice governmental representatives teamed with like-minded NGO staffers while pro-

choice NGOs are left on the sidelines. Lasher lists Concerned Women for America and Focus on the Family as two of the major anti-choice NGOs that regularly team with US governmental delegations to the UN. Hesse from Pathfinder reports that her organization has not noticed many climate changes at the UN, where they mainly work with UNFPA. Crane from Ipas says that she feels that the UN has not been intimidated by Bush in regard to international SRHR issues. Crane feels that the challenges have been found more in the UN's trend toward integrating HIV/AIDS funding and programming with other SRHR, which Ipas is against because of its shortchanging of focus and dollars for the two issues.

Within the UN, the UNFPA is a distinct organization with its own leadership changes and socio-political challenges during the Bush era. Barbara Crane from Ipas reports that her organization's interaction with UNFPA has actually increased during this era and that UNFPA has recently become more liberal on abortion after trying, unsuccessfully, to get their funding reinstated by the Bush administration by taking a more conservative approach during the first four or five years of the administration. She says that European donor governments have pushed hard for UNFPA to be in line with the Cairo programme. Crane reports that UNFPA is now tackling such progressive issues as combating sexual violence in Latin America and promoting miscarriage and post-abortion care through Manual Vacuum Aspiration, a highly affordable and safe procedure promoted within the SRHR movement. However, Crane is concerned that, with the new UN leadership and reform process after Secretary General Kofi Anan's departure, UNFPA may be left with less autonomy. She reports that there is discussion among SRHR movement actors to establish a new women's agency at the UN that could tackle these and other issues.

Successes

PAI's Lasher and Ipas' Crane note several successes that they feel the movement has experienced during the Bush era: the UK and IPPF creating the Safe Abortion Action Fund; other donor governments increasing their UNFPA contributions and their funding of NGOs; and support from the Gates, Hewlett, and Packard foundations. Lasher adds the following successes for his organization: heading off the application of the GGR to PEPFAR funds and getting progressive language into this year's foreign appropriations bill that addresses the need for increased family planning funding, the elimination of donated contraceptive supplies under the GGR, and the abstinence-only earmark under the PEPFAR AIDS plan. Crane adds as major victories during this period: getting the World Health Organization to include RU-486, the early abortion pill, on their approved

medications list and the WHO endorsing Manual Vacuum Aspiration as a viable early- and post-abortion method.

Cara Hesse from Pathfinder says that successes have been “few and far between” during the Bush era, but one that her organization has celebrated has been their successful lawsuit against the anti-prostitution pledge in PEPFAR funding in 2006. Due to the fact that so many SRHR and HIV/AIDS NGOs work with prostitutes to try to stop the spread of HIV/AIDS, NGOs were vehemently opposed to the Bush administration’s policy that NGOs that received PEPFAR funding had to take an oath to be against prostitution (and, some would say, against *prostitutes* themselves). As a result of Pathfinder’s lawsuit, US-based NGOs will now be able to speak out against the policy, work with prostitutes, and not have to make an anti-prostitution pledge if they provide services to prostitutes with their own private funding. The government was ordered by the Court to develop regulations for these NGOs to work with these clients through a separate organization with non-government funding.

Work in the New Congress of 2007

In this year’s Congress, Pathfinder and PAI have been fighting to exempt contraceptive supply cuts from the GGR through the Foreign Appropriations Bill, finally getting the issue further advanced in the new, Democratic-controlled, pro-choice majority Congress of 2007. Other legislation that both NGOs are fighting for this year include the elimination of restrictions on PEPFAR (AIDS) funding that call for one-third of the funding to be restricted to abstinence-only programming and the reinstatement of UNFPA funding from the US, possibly with a measure that excludes funding for China. President Bush has vowed to veto any and all legislation that would include these measures. Cara Hesse from Pathfinder sees a veto by Bush as an opportunity for the SRHR movement to get the message out about the extreme positions of the administration. Barbara Crane of Ipas feels that many SRHR allies lobbying against the SRHR restrictions in the Foreign Operations Bill this year played into the conservatives’ perspective by taking the more moderate position of focusing on “family planning” and not being willing to talk about abortion. She says that this kind of ‘watering down’ occurs frequently with other policies and funding issues, demonstrating the split between organizations such as Ipas who feel that SRHR advocates should not deviate from pushing for full SRHR, including abortion, and those that feel they are being more strategic by fashioning their message for a more conservative era. Ipas’ Crane is hopeful that abortion rights might be advanced in this year’s Congress through the Boxer-sponsored “Global Democracy Protection Act”, which essentially repeals the Global Gag Rule. Both Crane from Ipas and

Lasher from PAI think that the most impactful future occurrence for the SRHR movement in regard to international family planning would come in the form of having a pro-choice Democrat in the White House, with Lasher noting the possibility of (pro-choice) Republican presidential candidate Rudy Guliani.

Conclusion

This chapter provided an analysis of the Movement Action Strategies the SRHR movement utilized during the George W. Bush era. The three categories of frames the SRHR movement has utilized during the Bush era to advance their issues have run the gamut from a more conservative- and neo-liberal- minded approach designed to speak the language of the Bush administration to the more progressive frame of challenging the administration's approaches to SRHR by demanding a focus on results and scientific data. The SRHR movement utilized four main action strategies to advance their cause during the Bush era: fighting for their cause in the US Courts and Congress; working within the UN system; obtaining new funders; and producing research impact reports. Many NGOs within the SRHR movement had success with obtaining new funders and maintaining their presence at the UN and in international activities while most made little progress (until the new, Democratic-controlled Congress of 2007) in the US Courts and Congress. Producing research reports of impact from restrictive international family planning policies and funding decisions, such as the Global Gag Rule, were proven to be a powerful tool for several NGOs who gained media attention and support from non-US donor governments because of their findings.

CHAPTER 4

ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES, AND THE FUTURE

In this paper, I have utilized social movement and political process theory to examine how a social movement has responded to extremely negative political opportunity structures. In the social movement literature, the political context in which a movement operates within is referred to as the political opportunity structure, a concept that emphasizes the opening up and closing down of a social movement's opportunities for action within a particular political context (Tarrow, 1998, McAdam, et al, 1996). In Chapter Two, I explored the setting in which the SRHR movement has operated within during the George W. Bush era. I defined and described three key components of political opportunity structures for this study: changes in political alignments and conflicts; access to institutions; and influential allies and opponents.

Strongly conservative, patriarchal, religious fundamentalist worldviews from both the Bush administration itself and on the international stage have forced the SRHR movement to operate in a predominantly reactive nature. The election of a religious fundamentalist, neo-liberal conservative in George W. Bush and the concurrent international trends toward an era of increased globalization, growing neo-liberalism, and a rise in religious fundamentalisms were significant factors in the era's political alignments and conflicts. Access to institutions for the SRHR movement greatly diminished during this time, both in Washington and at the UN. Influential opponents far outnumbered allies, with the "Right to Life" movement being greatly enabled by the Bush administration, the largest opponent to SRHR. The SRHR movement was able to keep and even expand many of its allies during this time, namely domestic pro-choice congresspersons, private donor foundations, and foreign donor governments. The SRHR movement was able to effectively team with these allies because the Bush administration did not have a great deal of influence over these entities as a group.

The political opportunity structures that have existed during the Bush era, as described in Chapter Two, have in turn very strongly shaped the tactics, strategies, and responses that the SRHR movement has utilized. In Chapter Three, I explored the mobilizing or movement action strategies that the SRHR movement utilized to frame their issues and advance their cause during the Bush era. This included an in-depth description of the key actors in the SRHR movement during this time, as well as the strategies and actions they have employed to strive for their goals. Research conducted in this area included phone interviews with spokespersons from three NGOs who serve as central actors in the SRHR movement.

The three types of 'frames' the SRHR movement has utilized during the Bush era to advance their issues have run the gamut from a more conservative- and neo-liberal- minded approach designed to speak the language of the Bush administration to the more progressive frame of challenging the administration's approaches to SRHR by demanding a focus on results and scientific data. The SRHR movement utilized four main action strategies to advance their cause during the Bush era: fighting for their cause in the US Courts and Congress; working within the UN system; obtaining new funders; and producing research impact reports. Many NGOs within the SRHR movement had success with obtaining new funders and maintaining their presence at the UN and in international activities while most made little progress (until the new, Democratic-controlled Congress of 2007) in the US Courts and Congress. Producing research reports of impact from restrictive international family planning policies and funding decisions, such as the Global Gag Rule, were proven to be a powerful tool for several NGOs who gained media attention and support from non-US donor governments because of their research findings.

In this final Chapter, I will explore the achievements and ongoing challenges of the work of the SRHR movement during the George W. Bush era. I will identify and describe the main successes the movement experienced during this time, as well as the ongoing challenges they face in the future. I will then explore the future outlook for the movement, including the potential impacts of the new Democratic-controlled Congress, the impact of a pro-choice President being elected in 2008, possible alternative strategies for dealing with the restrictions of abortion policies such as the Global Gag Rule, and the movement's work to be done on the international stage, especially at UN conferences.

Movement Achievements

As evidenced in the phone interviews with spokespersons from several central actor NGOs, successes have been few and far between for the SRHR movement during the George W. Bush era. Perhaps one of the most significant shortcomings of the movement during the Bush era has been their inability to overturn the Global Gag Rule. However, there have been notable exceptions, as reported in the phone interviews and in the literature documenting the movement's actions. These successful exceptions have come in the form of countering further Bush administration anti-choice policies, encouraging alternate sources of funding for SRHR, finding and cultivating SRHR allies on the world stage to impact international documents, and producing research studies documenting the adverse effects of the Global Gag Rule. One of the major successes during this era was the revision of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to include "universal access to reproductive

health by 2015" which was in line with the agreements made at the Cairo conference in 1994. In light of the extremely negative political opportunity structures of the Bush era, it seemed that the MDGs, as originally written with a lack of SRHR, would be destined to 'turn back the clock' on SRHR in the developing world. However, the success of the SRHR movement lobbying for and finally getting the revision in 2005/2006, shows the powerful impact that a resilient movement can have when faced with overwhelming obstacles from one super powerful nation. In getting the MDGs in line with Cairo, even four years after their original implementation, the SRHR movement was able to undo some of the six years of damage the Bush administration had tried to effect at UN conferences and in UN documents.

A few notable successes for the SRHR movement during the Bush era have come in the form of successful lawsuits against the administration and actions taken to impact Executive Branch policies. Perhaps the most successful legal action occurred in 2006 when Pathfinder International (with others) was able to win a lawsuit against the Bush administration regarding the anti-prostitution pledge in PEPFAR (AIDS) funding (as discussed in Chapter 3). As a result of Pathfinder's lawsuit, US-based NGOs who receive PEPFAR funding will now be able to speak out against the policy, work with prostitutes, and not have to make an anti-prostitution pledge if they provide services to prostitutes with their own private funding. Although the decision leaves NGOs' work under US funding in a 'gagged' position, the Court's decision can be seen as a small victory considering NGOs can use private funds to do the work instead. SRHR NGOs are hoping that, in having the Courts affirm that such policies violate US-based NGOs' first amendment rights, the Courts might eventually hold that these types of policies are a first amendment violation even for non-US-based NGOs who receive US funding.

Another success for the SRHR movement during the Bush era also involves PEPFAR (HIV/AIDS) funding. Several of the central actor NGOs in the SRHR movement worked furiously during the Bush era to make sure that the Global Gag Rule would not also be applied to foreign NGOs who received PEPFAR funds. Due to the fact that so many foreign HIV/AIDS NGOs who receive PEPFAR funding also deal with family planning and abortion issues, this restriction would have put an undue burden on an even greater number of NGOs who receive US funding, this time in the form of PEPFAR funding. The World Health Organization, The World Bank, the European Union, and even USAID were cited by the movement as expert sources that maintained that the co-mingling of HIV/AIDS services with family planning services is the international standard of care that should be followed (GGRIP, 2004b). Many of these NGOs are already severely impacted by the loss of family planning funds due to the GGR; a loss of PEPFAR funding would ensure a severe drop in HIV/AIDS services because the US is such a major funder in that issue area as well.

SRHR NGOs were able to take a pro-active approach and publicize the grave consequences of such a policy decision and ensure that it was not instituted.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly in our world of results- and outcome-driven funding and programming, the SRHR movement successfully conducted and presented empirical research regarding impacts from the Global Gag Rule. The movement was able to mobilize a coalition of SRHR NGOs that included researchers and ground-level staffers to implement comprehensive impact studies in more than nine different developing nations that depend on US population assistance funding. They were then able to use the findings to spread the word about the impacts of the policy to the general public, the media, private funders, developing nation governments, and other donor governments. Their work was probably more successful during this era due to increased access to the low-cost media of the World Wide Web and video and DVD technology. Due to the work of the Global Gag Rule Impact Project, many non-US donor governments were willing to increase their funding in several areas. First, to UNFPA to make up for the shortfall caused by the elimination of US funding (although UNFPA does not fund abortions, they trust that the NGOs they fund will use separate monies for abortion services). Secondly, many non-US donor governments as well as private funders, increased their funding to individual NGOs to make up for the shortfall caused by the GGR. Lastly, several European donor governments teamed with the UK and IPPF to create the 'Safe Abortion Action Fund' to fund the lack of abortion and family planning services created by the shortfall from the GGR.

Ongoing Challenges

The SRHR movement has several challenges they must face during the remaining year and a half of the Bush era and possibly beyond, if another anti-choice President is elected in 2008. Chief among those challenges is the continuing existence of the Global Gag Rule. As yet, none of the movement's Court cases against the policy have managed to overturn it, and Congress has not managed to pass any legislation to overturn the policy. While the policy is in effect, millions of women in developing nations are being affected every day by reductions in funding for SRHR NGOs resulting from the Global Gag Rule. Leaders from the SRHR movement argue that unsafe abortion, pregnancy, and childbirth are leading causes of death in the developing world, and if healthcare providers cannot provide safe abortions, women are dying. Until George W. Bush is out of office, it is highly doubtful that the Congress could pass veto-proof legislation to overturn the Global Gag Rule. Only when and if a pro-choice President is elected, can the movement have any chance of overturning the policy. Even in that case, a pro-choice majority

in Congress is virtually required, because of their power to enact similar legislation if they so wish.

It is doubtful that the movement will have much success in diminishing the influence of the Bush administration in regard to international family planning funding before 2009. Thus far, Congress has been unable to reinstate UNFPA funding or donated contraceptive supplies under the Global Gag Rule. They have also not been able to remove the abstinence-only restrictions on one-third of PEPFAR funding nor reinstate any US funding for abortion services, which is restricted under the Hyde Amendment (see upcoming section on the work of the 2007 Congress). The Bush administration will most likely continue to push their anti-SRHR agenda at the U.N. and in international forums, although their message looks like it might be met with more resistance by an increasingly educated (international) public that is finding itself at odds with the administration over several facets of US foreign policy.

Future Outlook

2007 Congress

The SRHR movement has reason to be excited by the 2006 elections that changed the face of Congress to represent a Democratic, pro-choice majority. All of the NGO spokespeople interviewed for this study expressed optimism that the new Congress might be able to make some headway in turning back some of the restrictions the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress had supported. However, at this juncture, after the 2007 Congress is almost through their session, funding for international family planning under Bush does not look like it will change. In President Bush's federal 2008 budget request, submitted in February of this year, he called for a 25% decrease in funding for international family planning and reproductive health, while US funding has decreased 41% since 1995 when adjusted for inflation and the number of women in reproductive years in the developing world has grown exponentially (Americans for UNFPA, 2007, PAI, 2007, February 12).

Even though the new, Democratic-controlled Congress of 2007 now has a pro-choice majority, it is seemingly not enough to override a Presidential veto. Despite this fact, at the end of September, the Senate joined the House by passing their own legislation on the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill that would reinstate donated contraceptives to family planning providers under the Global Gag Rule and repeal the mandate that one-third of PEPFAR funding go to abstinence-only programming. The Senate bill went even further by adding a provision that would repeal the GGR entirely. These actions represent the first time in either the first or current phases of

the Global Gag Rule that both houses of Congress have passed legislation to modify or repeal the policy (PAI, 2007a). The White House has said the President will veto the entire \$34 billion Foreign Operations Appropriations bill if these provisions are included (PAI, 2007a).

One of the measures SRHR NGOs had hoped might be victorious this year was the reinstatement of UNFPA funding. Many NGOs and Congresspersons had been pushing for the reinstatement with a compromise measure of a dollar for dollar reduction of the total for the China contribution, where Bush maintains the government is engaged in coercive population practices. This dollar for dollar reduction would have allowed all other UNFPA funded countries to receive US funding, but exempted China, where the Bush administration takes issue.

However, at the beginning of September, the Senate was unable to block the Kemp-Kasten amendment⁷ from being attached to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, and the President subsequently announced that he would again deny *all* funding to UNFPA (Bromage, 2007, September 27, Hunter, Melanie, 2007, September 14). The President instead re-directed the \$34 million in funding Congress had appropriated for UNFPA to USAID, which is in charge of implementing the Global Gag Rule (Hunter, 2007, September 14). Interestingly, with a very narrow Democratic majority in the Senate, the Kemp-Kasten amendment won by only three votes while four 2008 Democratic Presidential candidates skipped the vote (Bromage, 2007, September 27). If the Senators had voted against the amendment, the President would not have had the legal recourse to withhold UNFPA funding. Representative Carolyn Maloney (D-NY) said of Bush's action, "A decision to reverse five years of erroneous decisions to de-fund UNFPA could have restored U.S. leadership in the eyes of the world on this critical issue. Instead, the Bush administration has once again turned its back on the planet's poorest and neediest women" (PlanetWire, 2007, September 7). The total Congressionally appropriated UNFPA funding eliminated to date by George W. Bush totals \$195 million (PlanetWire, 2007, September 7).

⁷ The so-called Kemp-Kasten Amendment, which was first introduced to block UNFPA funding in the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill in 1985, stipulates that no funds can be allocated to any organization or program "which supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or sterilization". It was first introduced in Congress in reaction to allegations of coercive population policies by the Chinese government. (See Chapter Two for further discussion)

Pro-Choice President in 2009?

Most of those working in the SRHR movement are anxiously awaiting the Presidential election of 2008 when George W. Bush cannot run again, and there is a possibility to elect a Democratic, pro-choice President. If a Democrat were to win office, Craig Lasher, senior policy analyst with NGO Population Action International, foresees the now 'tradition' continuing of a new, pro-choice President reversing all of the tenets of the Global Gag Rule on their first or second day in office, on the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, as was done in 1993 with Clinton (Lasher, 2007). A new pro-choice President would also have the ability to once again make the US a global leader in SRHR, standing firm on the promise of the Cairo Programme and now the MDGs. However, without a concurrent pro-choice majority in the US Congress, UNFPA funding would probably not be restored and the Hyde Amendment prohibiting funding of abortions for poor women and other women receiving federally funded healthcare would not be reversed. With a pro-choice Congress and President, the SRHR movement would not have to worry about a Presidential veto blocking legislation and funding passed by Congress, as they have for the past six years.

New Technologies

Several actors within the SRHR movement have high hopes for the promise of new technologies to combat illegal, unaffordable, and/or unsafe abortions. Manual vacuum aspiration (MVA), sometimes called "menstrual extraction" is an early abortion method in which lay people can be easily trained to perform the procedure with low-cost equipment and without the need for or cost of general anesthesia. In addition to using MVA in countries where early abortion is legal, MVA is also used in the developing world to remedy complications from incomplete abortions or miscarriages. The World Health Organization recommends MVA in the developing world over the more involved, risky, clinic- or hospital-based, and prevalent abortion method of dilatation and curettage (WHO, 2003). MVA equipment has been refined in the past few decades so that it is safe, effective, and low-cost. Many of those on the more progressive, or 'radical' side of the SRHR movement wonder if future relief from restrictions such as the Global Gag Rule and lack of funding for abortion services might come in the form of new technologies such as MVA. MVA is seen by some as a promising technological advancement for getting around national-level laws and funding restrictions limiting abortion access.

Others wonder if relief from restrictive laws and funding restraints might come in the form of pharmaceutical abortion. RU-486, or Mifeprex, is the early abortion pill

that has been available from France since 1988, China since 1992, and the US since 2000 (Wikipedia, n.d.). Mifeprex is available in several former Soviet block countries, India, and several Asian countries, but South Africa and Tunisia are the only African countries to allow it and is not approved in any South American or Central American countries, or in Mexico (Wikipedia, n.d.). The advantages of Mifeprex are that it is low-cost, heat stable, non-injectable, and is now listed on the approved medications list of the World Health Organization after extensive lobbying by the SRHR movement. Mifepristone, one half of the RU-486 treatment, is also an incredibly effective agent to stop obstetric hemorrhaging after childbirth. The *San Francisco Chronicle* reports, "There are 14 million obstetric hemorrhages a year, killing an estimated 128,000 women, almost all in the developing world, where most births happen at home without skilled medical care. Severe postpartum bleeding is the number 1 cause of maternal mortality worldwide: One woman dies every four minutes" (Wells, 2006, June 4). However, because of the fact that Mifeprex can also be used for a non-surgical abortion, it is either not available or is severely restricted in many developing countries.

Many individuals and organizations within the SRHR movement view these abortion methods as being able to put the power back into the hands of women, who were the only reproductive health care providers for centuries prior to M.D.s entering the field in the 20th century. Barbara Crane, Executive Vice President with NGO Ipas and a former US State Department family planning program staffer, sees promising alternatives to the restrictions of the Global Gag Rule via MVA and pharmaceutical abortion alternatives. She says that the evolution of technology changes the picture so that it is harder for anti-choice actors to impose their agenda on women in the developing world. Crane says that "the more (MVA) instruments that are out there, the better" (Crane, 2007). She notes that manual and pharmaceutical methods result in greater affordability, accessibility, and safety for women in developing countries. It remains to be seen, however, whether women and/or practitioners will be willing to use new technologies to circumvent the law if abortion is illegal in a particular area. The prevalence of unsafe abortions and high maternal mortality in the developing world may provide a breaking point at which women and providers are willing to do whatever it takes to ensure that women avoid death and disability.

SRHR at Beijing+15 in 2010

Much of the progress made in the area of SRHR has occurred at UN women's and population conferences since the mid-1970's. Of course, the Cairo programme is the pre-eminent document for the SRHR movement, striving for universal access to reproductive health care by 2015. Now that the MDGs have been aligned with Cairo,

the years following 2015 should provide major checkpoints to assess the success of Cairo. There are two large SRHR conferences scheduled back to back this Fall in London, the "Global Safe Abortion Conference" and the "Women Deliver" conference, which will focus more on safe motherhood and SRHR in general. "Women Deliver" is co-sponsored by the UN and UNFPA as well as several NGO central actors. The last major UN women's conference was held in Beijing in 1995, but it was not succeeded by the usual large follow-up conference at its ten-year anniversary due to the prevailing neo-liberal, religious fundamentalist world climate, as discussed in chapter two. After the disappointment of the MDGs and the small Beijing follow-up, many within the SRHR movement are questioning whether they should abandon UN forums all together, while others are pushing for official recognition of NGOs within the UN conference structure, to gain legitimacy for non-governmental entities. There is quite a bit of talk within UN circles and NGOs that work with the UN about forming a women's agency at the UN, so that women's issues are not left off the table when dealing with other UN issues. With the fifteen year Beijing anniversary coming up in 2010, the SRHR movement is actively contemplating what the world's geo-political climate might hold at that time, especially from the US. It will be interesting to see whether the movement decides to hold a large follow-up conference at that time or once again downplay or abandon the UN conference structure.

Conclusion

In this paper, I utilized social movement and political process theory to examine how a social movement has responded to extremely negative political opportunity structures. In regard to the Bush administration, the SRHR movement was continually denied access to this most important institution. This lack of access, and in fact, strident opposition to their cause, resulted in a standstill for the movement as well as a fight to try to win back earlier gains. One significant exception to this lack of progress during the Bush administration involved heading off the application of the Global Gag Rule to PEPFAR/AIDS funding by enlisting the power of allies within Congress, the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the European Union, and USAID, among others. In this achievement, the movement was able to see the power of enlisting allies from other social movements to advance their cause.

During most of President Bush's tenure, the Congress has been Republican-led, which did not allow any room for the SRHR movement to make progress. Even with a pro-choice majority in the Congress, there was not sufficient support to override a Presidential veto. Starting in 2007, the movement had some opportunities to make impacts in Congress, with the new, Democratic-controlled Congress. There

have been several bills drafted and moved through both houses that are reflective of the movement's goals, but it is doubtful that even this new Congress will be able to override Bush's veto power.

During the Bush era, the UN has experienced a great deal of change and turmoil, including the strong presence of neo-liberal and religious fundamentalist actors. This climate was perhaps most clearly illustrated in the drafting of the Millennium Development Goals that not only did not expand on the movement's goals, but didn't even include the Cairo programme agreed to by 180 countries only six years earlier. If the tenets of Cairo had been included with the original MDGs, the SRHR movement would have been able to spend more of their time working to meet Cairo's goal of universal access to reproductive health care by 2015 and less in fighting to win back already-agreed upon commitments. With a great deal of vocal opposition and work at subsequent UN conferences and meetings, the SRHR movement achieved a monumental success in 2005/06 when they were able to revise the MDGs to be in line with the Cairo programme.

Lastly, the movement was able to find some successes in exploring new strategies to combat negative political opportunity structures. The US courts represented one institution in which the movement was able to find success with several lawsuits. The courts ruled in favor of movement actors when they were US-based NGOs and had constitutionally protected rights, but did not extend favorable rulings in matters of foreign policy and funding for non-US-based NGOs. The movement is still striving for ways to ensure that these NGOs will have the same rights to free speech and association that they enjoy. Another strategy the movement found some success in during this era involved the acquisition of new funders. Foreign donor governments and private foundations proved to be strong allies who were willing to stand up to the Bush administration and increase their funding to SRHR movement actors.

This study has shown that, regardless of the existence or lack of negative political opportunity structures, a strong social movement can survive and even thrive. The negative environment may, in fact, challenge the movement to pursue additional actors and avenues for change that they might not have, had they been operating during a time of positive, supportive political opportunity structures. A negative environment can also allow a social movement to plan and strategize for future action in an era of increased opportunity. Further study of eras of positive and negative political opportunity structures for a particular social movement is needed in order to fully assess their impact on a particular movement's actions and success or failure.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF ACRONYMS

C-FAM—Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute (a non-profit)
CR UN—Christian Right at the United Nations
DAWN—Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (an NGO)
GGR—Global Gag Rule; common name now used by SRHR activists for the
“Mexico City Policy” instated in 1984 at the UN International Conference on
Population in Mexico City.
GGRIP—Global Gag Rule Impact Project
GNP—Gross National Product
ICPD—International Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 1994)
IFP—International Family Planning
IPPF—International Planned Parenthood Federation (an NGO)
MDGs—Millennium Development Goals
NARAL—National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (as in
‘NARAL Pro-Choice America’, the group’s current title; a non-profit)
NGO—Non-Governmental Organization (usually referred to as “non-profit”
organizations in the US and NGOs elsewhere)
PAI—Population Action International (an NGO)
PEPFAR—President’s Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief (US funding program)
PPFA—Planned Parenthood Federation of America (a non-profit)
POS—Political Opportunity Structures
PRI—Population Research Institute (a non-profit)
RLM—Right-to-Life Movement
RRA—Reproductive Rights Alliance (an NGO)
SRHR—Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (also used in reference to the
SRHR Movement)
UN—United Nations
UN CR—UN Christian Right (term used to characterize Christian Right social
movement’s work at and with the UN)
UN INSTRAW—UN International Research and Training Institute for the
Advancement of Women
UNFPA – United Nations Population Fund (formally UN “Fund for Population
Assistance”)
USAID—US Agency for International Development
WGNRR—Women’s Global Network for Reproductive Rights (an NGO)
WHO—World Health Organization

REFERENCES

- ACLU. (2004, 7/21). *Public Funding for Abortion*. Retrieved July 20, 2007 from <http://www.aclu.org/reproductiverights/lowincome/16393res20040721.html>
- Americans for UNFPA. (2007). *FY2008 Appropriations Report*. Retrieved September 20, 2007 from <http://www.americansforunfpa.org/NetCommunity/Page.aspx?&pid=412&srcid>
- Antrobus, P. (2004). *The Global Women's Movement*. London & New York: Zed Books.
- Ball, Wendy, and Charles, Nickie. (2006). Feminist social movements and policy change: Devolution, childcare and domestic violence policies in Wales. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 29 (2), 172-83.
- Barton, Carol. (2005, March). Where to for women's movements and the MDGs? *Gender and Development*, 13 (1), pp. 25-35.
- Bass, Emily. (2001, 6/7). Unconscionable care: Is the Religious Right compromising your healthcare? In Laura Flanders (Ed.), *The W effect: Bush's war on women*. (pp. 121-129). New York: The Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Benen, Steve. (2004). Strange bedfellows: Conservative Christians and the Bush administration are aggressively pushing a controversial "pro-family" agenda on the international stage—and they're teaming up with Islamic theocracies to do it. In Laura Flanders (Ed.), *The W effect: Bush's war on women*. (pp. 121-129). New York: The Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Benford, Robert D., and Snow, David A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611-39.
- Bishop, K. (2004). Politics before policy: The Bush administration, international family planning, and foreign policy. *North Carolina Journal of International Law and Commercial Regulation*, 29. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from LexisNexis, Auraria Library, University of Colorado at Denver.
- Blanc, Ann K. and Tsui, Amy O. (2005). The dilemma of past success: Insiders'

- views on the future of the international family planning movement. *Studies in Family Planning*, 36 (4), 263-76.
- Boseley, Sarah. (2006, February 6). *Britain defies US with funding to boost safe abortion services*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from <http://www.commondreams.org/cgi-bin/print.cgi?file=/headlines06/0206-04.htm>
- Bromage, Andy. (2007, September 27). Crouching tiger, hidden Senator. Dodd, Clinton, Obama and Biden skip a vote on abortion in the Senate and hand Republicans a victory. *New Haven Advocate*. Retrieved September 30, 2007 from <http://www.newhavenadvocate.com/article.cfm?aid=3297>
- Buss, Doris, and Herman, Didi. (2003). *Globalizing Family Values: The Christian Right in International Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Center for Reproductive Rights. (2003). *Breaking the silence: The global gag rule's impact on unsafe abortion*. New York: Center for Reproductive Rights.
- Chappell, Louise. (2006). Contesting women's rights: Charting an emergence of a transnational conservative counter-network. *Global Society*, 20 (4), 491-520.
- Cincotta, R.P., & Crane, B.B. (2001). The Mexico City policy and U.S. family planning assistance. *Science*, 294, 525-526.
- Cohen, Susan. (2006, Spring). The global contraceptive shortfall: U.S. contributions and U.S. hindrances. *Guttmacher Policy Review*, 9 (2). Retrieved September 17, 2006 from the Guttmacher Institute website: <http://www.guttmacher.org/media/inthenews/2006/02/06/index.html>
- Cooper, M.H. (1996). Reassessing Foreign Aid, *CQ Researcher*, 6, (36), 843-5.
- Congressional Quarterly, Inc. (2002, April 26). Foreign aid after Sept. 11. *CQ Researcher*, 12 (16), 361-392.
- Crane, B.B. (2005). Safe abortion and the global political economy of reproductive rights. *Development*, 48 (4), 85-91.
- Crane, B.B., & Dusenberry, J. (2004). Power and politics in international funding for

reproductive health: The US global gag rule. *Reproductive Health Matters*, 12 (24), 128-137.

Crossette, Barbara. (2005, March). Reproductive health and the millennium development goals: The missing link? *Studies in Family Planning*, 36 (1), pp. 71-79.

Davis, Gerald F., McAdam, Doug, Scott, W. Richard, and Zald, Mayer N., eds. (2005). *Social movements and organization theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ethelston, Sally, Bechtel, Amanda, Chaya, Nada, Kantner, Andrew, and Gibb Vogel, Carolyn for Population Action International (PAI). (2004). *Progress and promises: Trends in international assistance for reproductive health and population*. Washington, DC: Population Action International.

EuroNGOs, <http://www.eurongos.org/Default.asp?ID=1473>

European Commission. (2004, February 18). *Daily notebook, ACP-EU joint parliamentary assembly*. Retrieved November 16, 2006 from [http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:X7GJrIAmYmEJ:www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/presse/reunions_exceptionnelles/ACP_debat_du_jour_daily_notebook/2004/en/DG-INFO_ACPDN\(2004\)0218\(1\)_EN.doc+IPPF+loss+of+funding&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us](http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:X7GJrIAmYmEJ:www.europarl.europa.eu/registre/presse/reunions_exceptionnelles/ACP_debat_du_jour_daily_notebook/2004/en/DG-INFO_ACPDN(2004)0218(1)_EN.doc+IPPF+loss+of+funding&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us)

Feldt, Gloria. (2004). *The war on choice: The right-wing attack on women's rights and how to fight back*. New York: Bantam Dell/Random House.

Gerring, John. (2004, May) What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review* (98), 2, pp. 341-354.

Giffard, C. Anthony, and Van Leuven, Nancy. (2005). *Five Views on Development: How News Agencies Cover the UN Millennium Development Goals*. Retrieved June 10, 2007 from IPS-Inter Press News Service website: http://ipsnews.net/new_focus/devdeadline/MDGsgiff05.pdf

Giugni, Marco G. (1998). Was it worth the effort? The outcomes and consequences of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 98, 371-93.

- Global Gag Rule Impact Project (GGRIP). (2004). *The global gag rule and HIV/AIDS*. Retrieved May 1, 2006 from http://www.globalgagrule.org/pdfs/issue_factsheets/GGR_fact_HIV.pdf
- Global Gag Rule Impact Project (GGRIP). (n.d.). Retrieved October 5, 2006 from <http://www.globalgagrule.org/order.htm> and http://www.globalgagrule.org/pdfs/issue_factsheets/GGR_fact_contraceptive.pdf
- Grown, Caren. (2005). Trade liberalization and reproductive health: A framework for understanding the linkages, *Development*, 48 (4), 28-42.
- Guttmacher Institute. (2006, February 6). *UK pledges more than \$5 million to counteract effects of global gag rule*. Retrieved May 1, 2006 from <http://www.guttmacher.org/media/inthenews/2006/02/06/index.html>
- Hart-Landsberg, Martin. (2006). Neoliberalism: Myths and reality. *The Monthly Review*, 57 (11), Retrieved September 16, 2006 from <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0406hart-landsberg.htm>.
- Higer, A.J. (1999). International women's activism and the 1994 Cairo population conference. In Myer, K., & Prugl, E. (Eds.). *Gender Politics in Global Governance* (pp. 122-141). New York: Roman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Hinrichsen, Don. (2004). Ladies, you have no choice. *World Watch*, 17 (2), pp. 1-7.
- Hunter, Melanie. (2007, September 14). *Bush Denies Funding for UNFPA for Sixth Time*. CNSNews.com. Retrieved September 20, 2007 from <http://www.cnsnews.com/ViewNation.asp?Page=/Nation/archive/200709/NAT20070914d.html>
- Hwang, Ann. (2002). Exportable righteousness, expendable women: Global gag rule on abortion. *World Watch*, 15 (1), 1-12.
- International Planned Parenthood Federation (Western Hemisphere Region). (n.d.) *Global Gag Rule*. Retrieved September 15, 2006 from <http://www.ippf.org/en/What-we-do/Advocacy/Global+gag+rule.htm>

- International Planned Parenthood Federation. (2006a. January). *Death and denial: Unsafe abortion and poverty*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from http://www.ippf.org/NR/rdonlyres/8D4783F5-D516-47D3-8B34-61F6D510202A/0/IPPFDeathDenial_WEB_corrected.pdf
- International Planned Parenthood Federation. (2006b). *Safe abortion action fund*. Retrieved November 12, 2006 from <http://www.ippf.org/en/What-we-do/Abortion/SAAF+main.htm>
- International Planned Parenthood Federation. (2007). *Safe abortion action fund awards \$11.1m to reduce unsafe abortion*. Retrieved July 29, 2007 from <http://www.ippf.org/en/What-we-do/Abortion/Safe+Abortion+Action+Fund+awards+111m+to+reduce+unsafe+abortion.htm>
- Ipas. (2007a). *About Us*. Retrieved July 1, 2007 from http://www.ipas.org/About_Us.aspx
- Ipas. (2007b). *IDEAS: Introduction*. Retrieved July 1, 2007 from <http://ideas.ipas.org/cgi-bin/ideas.ipas.org/ideas.cgi?request=index>
- Joachim, J. (2003). Framing issues and seizing opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and women's rights. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(2), 247-274.
- Kaiser Family Foundation. (2003, July 10). *Daily women's health policy: Senate votes to repeal ban on foreign assistance to family planning agencies that promote, perform abortion*. Retrieved September 16, 2006 from http://www.kaisernetwork.org/daily_reports/rep_index.cfm?DR_ID=18707
- Keck, Margaret E., and Sikkink, Kathryn. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell University Press.
- Kort, Michele. (2004). Global sex rules: The price of silence. In Laura Flanders (Ed.), *The W effect: Bush's war on women*. (pp. 114-121). New York: The Feminist Press at CUNY.
- Kranish, Michael. (2006, October 9). Religious right wields clout: Secular groups losing funding amid pressure. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved March 16, 2007 from

http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2006/10/09/religious_right_wields_clout/?page=1

- Linders, A. (2004). Victory and beyond: A historical comparative analysis of the outcomes of the abortion movements in Sweden and the United States. *Sociological Forum*, 19 (3), 371-404.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D., and Zald, M.N. (1996). Introduction: Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes—Toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D., and Zald, M.N. (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 1-22). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. (1982). *Political process and the development of Black insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mercier, Rick. (2003, March 9). A Life and Death Issue. *The Free Lance-Star*. Retrieved September 16, 2006 from <http://www.fredericksburg.com/News/FLS/2003/032003/03092003/890429>
- Mercier, Rick. (2003, March 10). Davis is out front on family planning 'gag rule'. *The Free Lance-Star*. Retrieved September 16, 2006 from <http://www.fredericksburg.com/News/FLS/2003/032003/03092003/890429>
- Michelman, Kate. (2005). *With liberty and justice for all: A life spent protecting the right to choose*. New York: Penguin Group.
- NARAL Pro-Choice America. (2007a, 1/1). *Bush administration and congressional anti-choice actions*. Retrieved March 13, 2007 from <http://www.prochoiceamerica.org/assets/files/Bush-Congress-Actions.pdf>
- NARAL Pro-Choice America. (2007b, 1/1). *Bush's war on the right to choose and the right to privacy: By the numbers*. Retrieved March 13, 2007 from <http://www.prochoiceamerica.org/assets/files/Bush-By-the-Numbers.pdf>
- NARAL Pro-Choice America. (2007c, 1/1). *The Bush administration: Putting far-right ideology before science and our health*. Retrieved March 13, 2007 from <http://www.prochoiceamerica.org/assets/files/Bush-Ideology.pdf>

Neuman, W. Lawrence. (2006) *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Nielson, Poul. (2004, June). *Putting people first: Implementing the ICPD agenda and achieving the MDGs*. Speech of U.N. Commissioner for UNDP/UNFPA Board Meeting Special Event, Geneva. Retrieved May 2, 2006 from: http://www.unfpa.org/icpd/10/docs/poul_nielson.doc

Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President. (2007, June 19). *Statement of Administration Policy: H.R. 2764—State, foreign operations, and related programs appropriations act, 2008*. Obtained by email August 10, 2007 from Pathfinder International.

On the Issues. (2007). *George W. Bush on Abortion*. Retrieved June 4, 2007 from http://www.ontheissues.org/Celeb/George_W_Bush_Abortion.htm

Page, Christina. (2006). *How the pro-choice movement saved America*. New York: Perseus Books.

Pathfinder International. (2007). *FY08 foreign operations bill: Act now to support reproductive health measures in congress!* Retrieved June 15, 2007 from <https://secure2.convio.net/pf/site/Advocacy?pagename=homepage&id=150&JServSessionIdr010=9y72w56hz2.app7a>

Pellegrom, Daniel E. (2001, July 19). *Testimony before the United States Senate*. Pathfinder International. Retrieved June 15, 2007 from http://www.pathfind.org/site/DocServer/7-28_03_Resource_2001_Senate_Testimony2.pdf?docID=661

People's Health Movement, Medact, and Global Equity Gauge Alliance. (2005). *Global health watch: 2005-2006*. London: Zed Books.

Perrow, Francis, & Kampen, Joke von (eds.). (n.d.). *The road to global reproductive health: Reproductive health and rights on the international agenda, 1968-2003*. Retrieved October 7, 2006 from Eurongos and UNFPA, http://www.unfpa.org/upload/lib_pub_file/199_filename_eurongo.pdf

PlanetWire. (2005, September 16). *Silver lining for women's rights at world summit*.

Retrieved March 16, 2007 from <http://www.planetwire.org/details/5401>

Planet Wire. (2007, September 7). Bush administration defunds UNFPA for sixth straight year. Retrieved September 20, 2007 from <http://www.planetwire.org/>

Population Action International (PAI). (2004). *How the global gag rule undermines US foreign policy & harms women's health*. Retrieved May 1, 2006 from http://www.populationaction.org/resources/factsheets/FS5_GGR_final.pdf

Population Action International (PAI). (2005). *How access to sexual and reproductive health services is key to the MDGs*. Retrieved May 1, 2006 from http://www.populationaction.org/Publications/Fact_Sheets/FS31/RH_MDGs.pdf

Population Action International (PAI). (2006). *What you need to know about the Mexico City policy restrictions on US family planning assistance: An unofficial guide*. Retrieved May 1, 2006 from http://www.populationaction.org/resources/publications/globalgagrule/Mexico_City_Policy.pdf

Population Action International (PAI). (2007, February 12). *Bush's budget slashes international family planning*. Retrieved March 4, 2007 from http://www.populationaction.org/Press_Room/Viewpoints_and_Statements/2007/09_12_GGR.shtml

Population Action International (PAI). (2007a). *Senate Votes to Overturn Destructive Global Health Policies on Contraceptives and HIV/AIDS; President Has Threatened a Veto*. Retrieved September 20, 2007 from http://www.populationaction.org/Press_Room/Press_Releases/2007/09_06_Senate_Appropriations.shtml

Population Action International (PAI). (2007b). *Press release: This afternoon, the House appropriations subcommittee...* Retrieved June 15, 2007 from http://www.populationaction.org/Press_Room/Press_Releases/2007/House_Appropriations_Subcommittee_will_mark_up_bill_to_remove_ideology-based_restrictions_on_U.S._foreign_assistance.shtml

Population Action International (PAI). (2007c). *Trends in U.S. population assistance*.

Retrieved April 14, 2007 from <http://www.populationaction.org/Issues/U.S. Policies/ Trends in U.S. Population Assistance.shtml>

Population Action International (PAI). (n.d.). *The global gag rule timeline*. Retrieved March 16, 2007 from <http://www.populationaction.org/Publications/Reports/Global Gag Rule Restrictions/GagRuleTimeline.html>

Ragin, C.C. (1994). *Constructing social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rein, M., and Schon, D. (1991). Frame-reflective policy discourse. In Wagner, P., Weiss, C.H., Wittrock, B., and Wollmann, H. (Eds.), *Social sciences and modern states: National experiences and theoretical crossroads* (pp. 262-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Share the World's Resources (STWR). (2006). Neoliberalism and economic globalization: Privatization. Retrieved November 16, 2006 from <http://www.stwr.net/content/view/1350/#PRIVATIZATION>.

Tarrow, Sidney. (2001). Transnational politics: Contention and institutions in international politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 1-20.

Tarrow, Sidney. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements, collective action and politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tew, Susan, and Kirchgaessner, Christiane. (n.d.). *Unplanned pregnancy common worldwide: Neither legal status of abortion nor health risk deters women from terminating pregnancies*. News Release, Alan Guttmacher Institute. Retrieved March 15, 2007 from http://www.guttmacher.org/media/nr/abortww_nr.html

Toner, Robin. (2003, January 23). At a distance, Bush joins abortion protest. *The New York Times*. Retrieved June 12, 2007 from NewsBank/America's Newspapers, Auraria Library, University of Colorado at Denver.

UNFPA, United Nations Population Fund. (n.d.). *34 Million Friends of UNFPA*. Retrieved April 10, 2007 from <http://www.unfpa.org/support/friends/34million.htm>

UNFPA, United Nations Population Fund. (2007). *No woman should die giving life*. Retrieved June 15, 2007 from <http://www.unfpa.org/safemotherhood/>

UN-INSTRAW. (2006, October 16). *United Nations General Assembly adopts "universal access" target for reproductive health*. Retrieved March 14, 2007 from <http://www.un-instraw.org/revista/hypermail/alltickers/fr/0711>

United Nations Association of the United States of America. (2007, September 10). Senate Passes FY08 State Department Spending Bill Providing Increased UN Funding; Amendments Affecting UN Contributions Adopted. Retrieved September 20, 2007 from <http://www.unausa.org/site/pp.aspx?c=fvKRI8MPJpF&b=3375637&printmode=1>

United States Senate. (2001, July 19). *Mexico City policy: Effects of restrictions on international family planning funding*. Hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senate Hearing 107-165, Washington, DC.

USAID. (2007). *Family planning and reproductive health programs: Saving lives, protecting the environment, advancing U.S. interests*. Retrieved April 14, 2007 from http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/global_health/pop/popfaqbroch.pdf

Wells, Janet. (2006, June 4). Women's health: Collateral damage: Why can't we prevent more childbirth deaths? Blame abortion politics. *The San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved June 17, 2007 from <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2006/06/04/CMGPOIP80O1.DTL>

Wikipedia. (n.d.) *Mifepristone: Politics and use outside the United States*. Retrieved September 20, 2007 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mifepristone>

Wildman, Sarah. (2004, January). Abort mission: Ronald Reagan's miniseries may have bombed, but his global gag rule, vastly expanded by the Bush administration, is still spreading misery. *The American Prospect*, 15 (1), 15-18.

Women's Global Network for Reproductive Rights. (2004). A decade after Cairo: Women's health in a free market economy. *The Corner House*, Briefing 31, 1-36.

World Bank Group, The. (2004). *Millennium Development Goals: A complete listing of the goals, targets, and indicators for MDGs*. Retrieved June 10, 2007 from http://devdata.worldbank.org/gmis/mdg/list_of_goals.htm

World Health Organization (WHO). (2003). *Managing complications in pregnancy and childbirth: A guide for midwives and doctors: Section 3 – Procedures: Dilatation and curettage*. Retrieved July 16, 2007 from http://www.who.int/reproductive-health/impac/Procedures/Dilatation_P61_P63.html